CHAPTER 1

Introduction

*Violence and Bullying as Aspects of Education*

Recently, a jilted male secondary student used a crossbow to critically wound his ex-girlfriend in an incident in a New South Wales high school ("Crossbow Tragedy", 2003). In his defence he claimed to have been severely bullied over a long period of time. In addition, in 2002 seven students and staff at Monash University were wounded or killed by another student in their classrooms. This latter incident represented the first recorded deaths in an Australian institution of education at the hands of a solitary gunman. Furthermore, in October 2000 a young person whose experiences of school bullying had led to hospitalisation on three separate occasions, successfully undertook litigation against the Department of Education. His long-term exposure to the aggressive behaviours of his peers resulted in him stabbing his tormentors in an attempt at self-defence. Over the period of ten years represented in the body of work assembled in this portfolio, attempts have been made to prepare teachers, students and educational administrators to develop strategies to avoid and address just such eventualities. The suggestion that violence of this magnitude could ever occur in our education systems has often been met with derision and disbelief. Nevertheless, Australia has now joined the United States of America (USA), Britain and Germany as societies in which the sanctity of the school as a safe haven for learning has been breached forever.

The mass slaying of students and staff at Columbine State High School in Colorado, USA in April, 1999 precipitated an unprecedented national and international response. The moral, psychological, and social significance of the event has received continuous attention and numerous interventions have been developed as a result. This event, which could be described as the absolute extreme of school violence resulted in a critical re-evaluation of social values and rights in the USA, including a broad reaction against the strongly advocated right to bear arms. The occurrence of violent events both in Australian and in international educational contexts vindicates the focus of this research program and serves as an impetus to
continue to develop proactive solutions to the psychological and physical violence which is ever present in schools.

Placing violence in the context of education seems at first to be a contradictory notion, yet in recent times these previously polarised concepts are more frequently discussed in the same context. Traditionally, places of learning have been viewed as safe and inviolate, notwithstanding the equally familiar tradition of the school bully. It is reassuring that schools are still comparatively secure environments where most students on a daily basis, arrive safely and experience no aggression (Goldstein & Conoley, 1997). Yet violence in the form of mass murder of students and staff in schools has been increasingly reported, and in the past decade, addressing school bullying has become a priority for researchers and policymakers throughout the world.

The World Report on Violence and Health (World Health Organisation, 2002) clearly demonstrates the pervasive significance of this issue. This report notes a number of alarming statistics. For example, each year over 1.6 million people world-wide lose their lives to violence and young people aged 10 to 19 years old are at the greatest risk of a violent death in modern society, and are most at risk from each other. Furthermore, young men are twice as likely (14% of their deaths) as young women (7% of their deaths) to meet a violent end and are implicated in 90% of violent incidents in this age group.

Violence is increasingly being conceptualised as a component of the learning environment. Education providers have begun to noticeably extend their efforts to include methodologies, practices and policies to address these issues. Given the contemporary significance of this issue, the program of research represented in this portfolio attempts to contribute to international efforts to develop practical strategies to address the escalation of school violence and bullying as an education issue of immediate concern.
Aims

The primary purpose of this program of investigation has been to develop a research-based comprehensive model for intervention in bullying and violence in schools. In order to achieve such a goal, the aims of the research program were to:

1. Develop a pragmatic and efficient approach to measuring dimensions of bullying and violence in selected schools to identify key issues of concern in a specific educational context.
2. Address bullying and violence comprehensively by developing a pragmatic intervention that can be customised to the specific needs of each school.
3. Critically analyse the characteristics of perpetrators and victims to identify potentially useful strategies to inform individual intervention design.
4. Elucidate factors that can serve to inform educational policy and practice.

Professional Experiences Underpinning the Research Program

The author’s motivation to address the phenomena of violence and bullying in schools resulted from long-term professional involvement with students manifesting a range of problematic behaviours. These were linked to psychological and intellectual disorders in mainstream and specialist classrooms within a range of education systems throughout Australia. This included aggressive behaviours as well as victimology that often characterize the conditions of severe intellectual disability, emotional and conduct disorders, adolescent psychiatric illnesses, sociopathy and juvenile criminology. The author’s professional involvement included teaching and developing education programs for students with emotional and behavioural disorders in schools, psychiatric facilities, and juvenile detention and high security units with young people for whom murder, rape and attempted suicide had been elements of their recent life experience. These professional experiences provided first-hand knowledge of the limitations of traditional approaches to intervention and an impetus to discover new pedagogy to inform successful intervention.

Students professionally known to, and taught by, the author impacted on the evolution of the work described here. Students include a young man who committed one of the most high profile and shocking rape-murders in Australia in recent times.
This youth had experienced many years of abuse from a school bully and eventually stabbed his tormenter in an effort to stop the abuse. Another student known to the author was murdered while undertaking part-time work to finance his studies. In fact, during the course of this program of research the author has had the opportunity to critically analyse the behaviours and beliefs of both perpetrators and victims of school bullying and violence, which has served to inform the development of new solutions for intervention.

**Initiatives to Operationally Define Violence and Bullying in Schools**

**Defining School Violence**

Violence and bullying in schools could not be thoroughly and effectively addressed whilst such terms remained to be operationally defined as they related to school contexts. In 1994, the Commonwealth government instituted an inquiry into violence in Australian schools. At this time, no accepted or carefully constructed definition of violence in schools had been articulated. Early definitions were inadequate in several key respects because they did not consider the behaviour of members of the school community other than students, did not differentiate school violence from the general list of aggressive behaviours evident in society, and did not provide realistic parameters applicable within school settings and manageable by school personnel and resources.

Incidents such as those described earlier are not difficult to classify as “school violence”—the perpetrator and victims were all part of a close community of people engaged in educational pursuits in a purpose-built facility. Similarly, shootings in schools in the USA over many years and in Scotland and Germany more recently, which were characterized by being perpetrated by students of the school, clearly fall within the reasonable parameters of a definition of school violence.

When work on this portfolio commenced, definitions of school violence existed only to facilitate student suspensions and expulsions and included definitions which can be considered school violence such as, “striking or use of force against a student or staff member; any deliberate act which causes injury to a student or staff member” (Australian Commonwealth Government, 1992, p. 225) and “assaulting,
striking, threatening or harassing a student or staff member; sexual harassment and vandalism” (Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs, 1998, p. 21). In addition, the Australian parliamentary committee of inquiry established in October 1993 to investigate school violence stated in their findings that “there is little data relating to the levels and changes in levels of violence in schools” (Australian Commonwealth Government, 1994, p. vi) partly because no definitive concept of what constituted school violence had been proposed.

Publication of the “Schools Australia Report” by the Federal Government in 1992 seemed to indicate a substantial rise in the incidence of violence in schools. However, closer scrutiny of the statistics reported demonstrates that all incidents occurring on school grounds, irrespective of whether they involved members of that school community, were reported as “school violence”. Hence these statistics represent an inflated incident frequency of what could reasonably be termed “violence in schools”. The latter was pointed out to the 1994 Commonwealth Government inquiry in a submission by the author (Jenkin, 1994c, see Appendix 4.1.1) and a clear operational definition put forth for the inquiry’s consideration. The following definition was ultimately accepted and used in the final report of the inquiry:

Violence in schools refers to violent, assaultative or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or school community members with each other, or with school property, which occur within normally accepted school hours and within normally accepted school boundaries and situations. (Australian Commonwealth Government, 1994, p. 1)

It is important to note that this definition specifically excludes acts of violence which occur outside accepted school bounds, situations and times, or which represent acts perpetrated against the school by persons outside the school community. In particular, it was argued that community-based gangs who enter school premises during or outside schools hours to engage in acts of vandalism or violence should not be represented in the statistics or definition of “school violence”. Such tragic instances as the recent school invasion by rebel Chechnyans in southern Russia where over a hundred school children died (Children rescued, 2004) therefore
cannot be classified as school violence under this definition. The definition resulted in setting limits confining the operational definition of school violence specifically to the interactions between members of the school community whilst in or at the school. While it had previously been argued that it is not possible to separate the responsibilities of the school from those of the wider community, it was successfully posited in formulating the above definition that it is imperative for the health, safety and welfare of teachers and students that precisely such a distinction was made. Hence this definition has been an attempt to acknowledge the limitations of authority, liability and expertise of school personnel in managing violence and more specifically to formalise the parameters of their involvement in intervention. In this way schools can define the parameters of their responsibility in relation to school violence and ensure the wider community accepts that it, and not teachers alone, is required to provide safe and secure environments for students.

**Defining School Bullying**

There has been a similar need to operationally define school bullying. Over the past ten years, bullying in schools has also become a major focus of international research and concern (Besag, 1994; Harachi, Catalano & Hawkins, 1999; Pepler, Craig, Zeigler & Carach, 1993; Pepler & Craig, 1995). However, much of the early research about bullying originated in the Scandinavian countries including the work of Heineman whose term ‘mobbing’ was adopted by Olweus. Olweus was responsible for the initial interest and focus on ‘mobbing’ as he instigated the preliminary research in Sweden in 1970.(Olweus,1999). Other contributors included Dueholm in Denmark who examined the school ‘mobbe’ (Dueholm,1999) as well as Bjorkvist, Osterman and Lagerspetz who replicated Olweus’ research from Sweden in Finland(1982). These early researchers lay the foundation for the plethora of research which has followed.

It has been established that bullying is endemic in high schools in Australia and overseas with up to 13% of all students reporting bullying (Byrne, 1993; Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 1996). Up to 25% of boys in primary schools report being frequently bullied and 27% have engaged in physically, psychologically or verbally bullying behaviour on three or more occasions (Alsaker & Brunner, 1999; de Almeida, 1999). A surprising degree of consistency is evident in the international literature relating to bullying in high schools with an overall 10 to 13% of students reporting involvement
as either a bully or victim. Bullying is reported to peak during the early years of high
school, and gradually diminish as students develop a more mature sense of empathy
and a willingness to support those being victimised (Rigby & Slee, 1993a).
Furthermore, cultural (Morita, Soeda, Soeda & Taki, 1999), gender and age
differences can be demonstrated in more recent work including the data gathered to
authenticate elements of this portfolio (see Chapter 2).

Specific groups or individuals may be targeted and bullies often focus
attention on salient features of the victim to ensure the greatest impact of their
victimisation. Importantly, the social costs of long-term bullying are now readily
apparent with suicide (Olweus, 1999), murder (Burnage, 1989), attempted murder
(Healey, 2001b, see Appendix 3.6) and serious psychological problems documented
internationally as resultant consequences of violent and bullying behaviour. Despite
consistent research findings pointing to the pervasiveness of school bullying, Harachi
et al. (1999) contend that “there appears to be no one standard definition of bullying
in the popular or research literature” (p. 298). Definitions which have been adopted
and formed the basis of current research have ranged from the simple to the complex,
including those of the following researchers:

A student is being bullied or victimised when he or she is exposed repeatedly
over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students.
(Olweus, 1993)

Bullying is repeated aggression, verbal psychological or physical conducted by
an individual or group against others. (Byrne, 1993)

Bullying is repeated aggression, psychological or physical, of a less powerful
person by a more powerful person or group of persons. (Rigby, 1996)

Bullying is a behaviour which can be defined as the repeated attack—physical,
psychological, social or verbal by those in a position of power which is
formally or situationally defined on those who are powerless to resist with the
intention of causing distress for their own gain or gratification. (Besag, 1994)
The latter definition seems to incorporate a wide range of key elements and as such seems to represent a more comprehensive definition. Whilst various definitions of what constitutes bullying abound, such definitions generally incorporate similar components of bullying including the repetitive nature of the abuse; the range of behaviours including psychological, physical and verbal aggression; the intention to inflict harm on the victim; and power differences. For example, the repetitive nature of bullying has resulted in definitions that characterise school bullying as more than one event, often occurring as a pattern of hurtful behaviour over a period of time, which differentiates it from episodic violence or assault (Olweus, 1993; Jenkin, 1999, see Appendix 4.1.4). Hence bullying has been distinguished from other anti-social behaviours by being characterised as repeated exposure to the negative actions of another student or group. Bullying has also been defined as constituting specific types of behaviour. These behaviours are described as both overt and covert, psychological and physical (Bjorkqvist & Osterman, 1999), which can be classified as abusive (Olweus, 1999). Bullying is also distinguished from other behaviour based upon intentionality. The specific purpose of bullying is to harm the recipient and as such there is a conscious intention. (Olweus, 1993; Smith, 1994). Intentionality must be examined in relation to the claimed intention of the bully, who often denies or diminishes the purpose of the behaviour, the actual impact on the victim and the congruence of the two (Quine, 1999). Bullying is also characterised as involving an unmistakable power differential between the bully and victim, which does not always correlate with the size, age or formal social status of the bully or victim. Children, for example, can bully adults. Effective bullies may be smaller, younger or apparently less socially powerful than the victim—their power is based in their propensity or preference for engaging in threatening anti-social behaviour, their fearlessness in the face of authority, and the vicarious appeal of this to their peers.

Over time, definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, and a number of critical dimensions now differentiate bullying behaviour from violence, fighting, play and general conflict. New perspectives have evolved during the course of this research that contribute to developing a more refined operational definition and acknowledge particular psychological elements evident in the paradigm. For example, as an outcome of analysis of student comments in relation to bullying and a re-examination of current literature, it would seem that at
least two more factors define bullying. A lack of reciprocity was identified as a key factor whereby bullying is conceptualised to involve the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who, though sometimes resistant, is not aggressive in return. Attention to the factor of lack of reciprocity enables the differentiation of bullying from fighting and conflict (Besag, 1994; Healey, 2001a, see Appendix 4.6.2), an interpretation that teachers often find difficult to accept or identify. The work presented in this portfolio contributes to expanding current definitions of bullying by considering the lack of reciprocity as a key indicator. Additionally, capacity for resistance or resilience is also a critical factor, since bullied individuals differ in their ability to cope with and effectively resist the victimisation. Victims of bullying are not necessarily all passive, ineffectual individuals incapable of resistance. However, the capacity to resist in a non-aggressive, socially acceptable manner often does not afford the victim any protection at all. Their help-seeking and reporting of incidents or their resilient behaviours in continuing to attend school and attempt to get on with their lives must be supported within their social milieu to be effective. Unfortunately, this is often not the case; as such individuals are often viewed as coping and therefore not in need of assistance or support. To address this issue, the following operational definition is now proposed as a perhaps more sophisticated and comprehensive statement of what constitutes bullying:

Bullying involves the repeated, intentionally harmful, psychological or physical actions of one or more socially powerful individuals against an individual who cannot effectively resist and who does not reciprocate the actions.

New Perspectives on Violence and Bullying in Schools

Emerging perspectives have informed and expanded current understandings of the nature and psychology of bullying. Discourse which compares an essentially masculine dominance in the perpetration of violence to the apparent increase in girls’ aggression through bullying (Chesney-Lind, 2003; Espelage, 2003; Stein, 2003) indicates that although girls appear now to be more inclined towards bullying, serious violence is still the domain of the masculine gender. Indeed, some researchers have defined gender as causal rather than correlational (Egger, 1995;
Scutt, 1995). Student and teacher views about the seriousness of bullying and the role of help-seeking skills as a purposeful intervention (Holt, Espelage, Keyes & Koenig 2003; Murray & Newman, 2003) have also recently been examined. This research indicates that students are not convinced of teachers’ capacity or willingness to intervene to assist victims of bullying. The social status and popularity of aggressive individuals during adolescence is becoming a key focus of research. For example, Espelage and Mebane (2003) showed that students in the USA manoeuvred for social position in terms of establishing their popularity from a very young age. While it cannot be stated that bullies are popular, it is quite clear from the data gathered for this research that the students most often identified as bullies are the popular students. This perhaps simply means that being popular puts students in a powerful social position from which to enact harmful behaviours with immunity. In addition, the apparent Code of Silence (Brinkley, Saarnio & Christy, 2003) used by peers to protect aggressive individuals from detection while at the same time ensuring personal protection from retaliation is a focus of recent research.

Some research has also applied bullying and violence intervention strategies, theory and approaches to workplaces, corporate mission statements, and even international conflict situations. For example, workplace bullying as a new perspective of the phenomena is addressed by McCarthy, Sheehan and Wilkie (1996), with the practice of “whistle-blowing” seen as a key area for concern for victimisation. Bullying is also often seen as a critical indicator of the dysfunctional state of an entire society when long-term consequences are assessed in terms of social capital and investment in the future. Social capital is described by Coleman (1988) as a concept of mutual benefit to members of a society and as incorporating strong and varied connections to social institutions such as schools. The use of depersonalising descriptors such as “human resources” (Rees, 1994) and the tendency to consider social issues in terms of economic rationalism can be seen as contributing to less supportive and responsive organisations (Dalton, Draper & Weeks, 1996). The emphasis on economic capital fails to acknowledge the value of social capital as the true indicator of prosperity in a community and it is apparent that corporate strategy is undergoing some revision as the financial implications of failure to assist those being bullied in the workplace become apparent. Stress, absenteeism, harassment claims and the incapacitation of workers through psychological damage.
all deplete social capital and add substantially to the fiscal responsibilities of the organisation (De Maria, 1996; Lennane, 1996; Mann, 1996). The application of theoretical constructs of bullying beyond the classroom and into the social foundations of community reinforces the need for a widely applicable and comprehensive approach to intervention. This need led to the conceptualisation and implementation of the model for intervention described in this portfolio, which can be adapted to serve a broad range of social organisations and needs.

Previous research in this field has seemed to focus upon defining the parameters of bullying and violence in schools generally and describing the experiences, attitudes and perceptions of individuals involved in the process. The nature of bullying and violence in terms of frequency, types of behaviours and the characteristics of victims and perpetrators have been thoroughly explored. As mentioned previously, we are aware that bullying peaks in the early years of high school when younger students show little concern for victims (Rigby, 1996), and we can also describe the differences between male and female involvement, cultural variances, rates, types and impact of bullying and violent behaviours across these dimensions. This research evidence has been important in that it has addressed vital within-construct issues that have facilitated conceptual advances in our understandings. However, what seems not to have been fully examined are some of the psychological determinants of bullying and violence in young people. This includes the possibility that such psychological orientations are based in personality structures, in individual response mechanisms resulting from stress or from a selected and deliberate preference for the behaviour. These are challenging concepts and may well be the focus of future research. During the course of this investigation promising new perspectives on this issue emerged, emanating from analyses of data gathered and reflection on students’ qualitative responses. Several new insights into the psychological bases of the phenomena of violence and bullying were also revealed during examination of the results in this research program. These included the proposition of resolving violence through education as opposed to a preventative focus, challenging the perception that violence-viewing influences young people to engage in violence, exploring resiliency as a critical factor in resisting bullying, establishing Peer Advocacy (Healey, in press) as a functional new response to
intervention, and the recognition of peer abuse as a legislated child protection issue for school, aspects of which are discussed below.

Findings emanating from the present investigation included that students' levels of resiliency to bullying differed and in particular cultural differences in girls' resiliency were identified which suggested that intervention strategies may be strengthened by attempting to account for these differences. In addition, interpretation of the data indicated that peer abusive behaviours and those identified in the literature as child abuse were closely correlated and prompted an analysis of the relevance and applicability of child protection legislation. It is suggested that child protection legislation be applied to the phenomenon of school bullying as a protective intervention (see Healey, 2001, Appendix 3.6 and Appendix 4.6.2). Further, it became evident that socio-cultural factors including the social status and popularity of bullies as indicated by peers were also significant. Indeed, the role of young people as advocates for their bullied peers seemed to be a critical factor in addressing the bullying paradigm, and as a result of this research program Peer Advocacy (see Appendices 3.9, 3.10 and 4.5.4,) was devised and developed as an adaptive functional response to bullying and is described as a curricular intervention in this document.

Further, the notion that violence-viewing contributes to the aggressive behaviours of young individuals is controversially challenged in this work. A critical examination of the characteristics of research in this area suggests that research participants are typically exposed to simulated violence. Given this is simulated rather than actual violence the external validity of the findings of these studies seems questionable (see Appendix 3.4). This suggestion has important implications for anti-bullying and anti-violence intervention in that other causes need to be identified if viewing violence is not accepted as pivotal in the development of violent behaviours. Therefore, intervention strategies need to be developed to address a broader range of potential causal mechanisms. Resolving violence through education was the preliminary premise explored and is foundational to the portfolio of work. Overall, these perspectives may have the potential to inform new solutions to underpin intervention and also contributed to the formulation of the comprehensive model for intervention presented in this portfolio. These perspectives are addressed in Chapter 3 of the research reported in this portfolio.
The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention

Model Development

It became apparent during the course of the investigations underpinning the work presented in this portfolio that interventions which focus primarily on individuals or exclusively on policy development or the application of specific anti-bullying or anti-violence curricula in an educational context are inadequate. Rather intervention seems to need to be embedded within a supportive macro-system of policy, management, resources and professional development for all members of the specific community. In addition, the management of deviant behaviours in the classroom and schools, in particular the management of violence and bullying, seems to require the application of a comprehensive intervention. This strategic whole-school approach seems salient given international events related to school violence and the deaths of numerous students as a direct outcome of peer abuse. As such, proactive, protective, and preventative intervention strategies spread across the educational community and at all levels of education seem essential to the management of aggressive individuals in educational settings given punitive responses alone have limited efficacy (Goldstein et al., 1998). Secondary school students who may well not have received any early intervention or education regarding bullying and violence are specifically targeted in this approach. While it is evident that early intervention is preferable, sustained programs of intervention and education will have greater long-term impact. In this portfolio, programs for intervention at both the primary and secondary levels are described (see Chapter 4).

Research was undertaken and data gathered to validate the model presented in this portfolio, which evolved out of pragmatic necessity. The investigation involved collecting over three thousand responses to the School Safety Survey (see Chapter 2 and Appendix 2.1) from male and female high school students in single sex, co-educational, denominational and state schools.

The resultant model—The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Violence and Bullying—is applicable to corporate situations and organisations as well as educational contexts and is recommended as a
pragmatic solution irrespective of the population or location in which the behaviours occur. Primarily this work presents the application of the model to secondary educational settings in relation to intervention in bullying, but appendices demonstrating the model’s relevance and application in other settings are also included. The model presented in this portfolio (see Chapter 4 for a full description) is an attempt to synthesise key approaches identified by research as successful into one synergistic model that serves to foster successful intervention.

**Components of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention**

The first component of the model developed involves an investigation of the parameters of violence and bullying in the school setting using the School Safety Survey adapted and further developed for use in this research and other available data such as school suspensions and critical incident reports. The survey instrument used here to assess bullying behaviour yields substantive data related to students’ perceptions, experiences and attitudes in relation to violence and bullying in the school. The next five components of the model are initiated on the basis of the data collected and should be applied simultaneously in the educational setting. The second component involves an education program to provide staff development and knowledge acquisition in relation to violence or bullying and determining the appropriate focus of community education programs. This component also provides the structure for the development of the following four components of intervention. The third component represents the development of specific school policy based on the data gathered at the specific school. The fourth component involves the school determining the level, focus and types of organisational restructuring required to address the issues of student safety and supervision identified in the school data for the particular setting. The fifth component involves schools implementing generic, widely applicable curricula for the general student population to provide education in regard to origins, indicators and appropriate responses to violence and bullying at school. The sixth component involves assisting teachers and other supporting professionals at the school to address the psychological needs of individuals involved in the bully/victim paradigm. This could include the acquisition by victimised students of personal attributes to facilitate resistance and resiliency to violence and
bullying through a structured training program. It may also involve instruction for violent or bullying individuals in empathy, responsibility and other personal attributes. Each of these components is discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of this portfolio.

**Diagrammatic Summaries of the Structure and Contents of the Research Program and Portfolio**

**Overview**

Diagrammatic summaries of the substantial contents of this portfolio of work, research and intervention were developed to give an overview of the structure of this overarching statement, the key theoretical perspectives addressed in Chapter 3, the key components of the comprehensive model discussed in Chapter 4, and the appended scholarly works emanating from these components of the research design. Dossiers of research, professional development, community involvement, government advisory roles, and pedagogical activities are also referenced in the Appendices in order to demonstrate factors that facilitated the development of the model of intervention. These were undertaken by the author as a consultant to government sectors and departments, to private and state schools and their teaching, executive and administrative personnel and divisions as well as with families in school communities and with individuals. Hence the diagrammatic summaries to be presented below assist in presenting a holistic view of the portfolio of research and practice over the period of the program. Figure 1.1 illustrates the overall structure of the presentation of the products in the volumes included in the portfolio.

**Volume 1.** Volume 1 of this portfolio contains the overarching statement describing the portfolio of research undertaken. Each of five chapters that constitute the overarching statement is depicted in Figure 1.1. The current chapter introduces the concepts and defining features of bullying and violence in schools and presents diagrammatic summaries of the research program undertaken. Chapter 2 presents the analysis of data, which informed the development of the model and provided evidence underpinning the development of new theoretical perspectives. Chapter 3 presents a discussion of five theoretical perspectives emanating from this program of research. Chapter 4 presents an overview of the key elements of the Macarthur
Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention. Chapter 5 presents a summary and discussion of potential future research directions and requirements for effective intervention. Appendices of data tables and figures pertaining to Chapter 2 are also included in Volume 1.

Volume 2. Volume 2 contains scholarly and published works as appendices which are related to the theoretical perspectives identified and discussed in Chapter 3.

Volume 3. This volume contains published works and other documents as appendices for Chapter 4, that support and illustrate the development of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention.

Volume 4. This volume contains two manuals developed to assist educators implement specific aspects of the model. Additionally, the published curriculum “Resolving Violence through Education” (Jenkin, 1996) is appended in this volume.
Figure 1.1. Diagrammatic Overview of Chapter and Volume Contents
Figure 1.2: Research Products linked to Chapter 3: New Theoretical Perspectives on Violence and Bullying

Figure 1.2 lists, in chronological order, scholarly works which are contained in Appendices 3.1 to 3.11. These publications relate to each of five new perspectives identified during the course of this research program. Each perspective is discussed in Chapter 3 of the portfolio with reference to relevant papers and publications. These research products include conference papers and published articles which place on the record, often for the first time, new aspects of violence and bullying in schools and which indicate avenues for future research and intervention.
# Chapter 3

## Research Products Linked to New Theoretical Perspectives Related to Violence and Bullying in Schools

### Resolving Violence through Education


### Challenging the Impact of Violence Viewing


### Peer Abuse as a Child Protection Issue


### Resiliency as a Critical Factor in Resisting Bullying


### Peer Advocacy as a Key Strategy for Bullying Intervention

- **3.9** Healey, J. (in press) A Theoretical Construct For Peer Advocacy as a functional response to Bullying: empirical basis, refereed doctoral paper accepted for presentation at SELF Research Centre International Conference, Berlin Germany July 2004 and accepted for publication in proceedings
- **3.10** Healey, J. (in press) A Theoretical Construct For Peer Advocacy as a functional response to Bullying: Contributory Theories, refereed doctoral paper accepted for presentation at SELF Research Centre International Conference, Berlin Germany July 2004 and accepted for publication in proceedings

### New Theoretical Perspectives on Violence and Bullying in Schools


*Note.* * Indicates published article meeting requirements of degree.

**Figure 1.2.**

Appendices to Chapter 3: Research Products Linked to New Theoretical Perspectives on Violence and Bullying in Schools
**Figure 1.3 Research Products Linked to Chapter 4: Macarthur Model for Comprehensive Intervention**

Figure 1.3 refers to the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention which developed over the period of the research program. Appendices which relate to this aspect of the portfolio are enumerated in relation to the relevant component of the model and an overview of the six components of the model is presented in Chapter 4. While there are obvious links between the perspectives that emerged and the model which was devised as an intervention, it is important to note that the appended products and publications represented in Figure 3 are specifically related to the model. As such, these research products are additional to the products presented in relation to the perspectives identified in Chapter 3. The products in the appendices for Chapter 4 include a published and internationally distributed curriculum (see Appendix 4.5.1) and training modules for specific aspects of the intervention (Appendix 4.4.1 is a manual related to organisational restructuring; Appendix 4.2.3 is a manual for application of the Model by schools). These are appended in Volume 4. Also included is a range of papers and other documents illustrating the involvement of the researcher in the community of professionals addressing the issues of violence and bullying in schools.

Figure 1.3 is not only a diagrammatic representation of the components of the model, but also the recommended methodology for delivery. Component 1 of the model is undertaken first as it is pre-requisite in establishing the research base for the comprehensive intervention. This component provides for the collection and analysis of baseline data to determine the nature and parameters of violence and bullying in the particular setting. This data is then utilised in the further five components to customise the intervention to the specific needs of the setting. Component 2 relates to the education and training of staff and community members, including examination of the data collected, and it is during this preparatory period that decisions are made which relate to the remaining 4 components. Each of the other components is then presented in a horizontally linear fashion to illustrate the need to undertake each component simultaneously and progressively to facilitate change.
CHAPTER 4
THE MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN VIOLENCE AND BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

COMPONENT 1
DETERMINING THE NATURE AND PARAMETERS OF VIOLENCE AND BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

COMPONENT 2
TRAINING AND PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY REGARDING VIOLENCE AND BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

COMPONENT 3
POLICY DEVELOPMENT

4.3.1 Structuring A Policy For A Non-Violent School, paper presented at Australian Institute of Criminology 2nd Conference on Violence, Canberra 1994

COMPONENT 4
ORGANISATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

4.4.1 Understanding and Managing Challenging behaviours for Youth in Detention, Staff Training modules (Robertson Education Unit For Violent Offenders) For Dept. Juvenile Justice 1994


COMPONENT 5
CURRICULUM FOR ALL STUDENTS REGARDING VIOLENCE AND BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

4.5.1 Resolving Violence Curriculum For Secondary Schools Published 1996 –2004, ACER
4.5.2 Bullybusters Curriculum in development for Primary Schools 1995-2004
4.5.3 Bullybusters -A Model for Intervention and Resilience, paper presented at National Protective Behaviours Conference, Canberra 1995
4.5.4 (in press) Peer Advocacy-A Functional Response to Peer Abuse: structure and processes, paper accepted for SELF Research Centre International Conference, Berlin, July 2004

COMPONENT 6
INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS INVOLVED IN VIOLENCE AND BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

4.6.1 Suspension Support for children and Youth with behaviour problems, Widening Horizons: New challenges, directions and achievements, 1994, ACER
4.6.2 Bullying & Resiliency-A Model For Individual Intervention, paper presented at Protective Behaviours Conference, ACU, Sydney, 2002

Note. * Indicates published article satisfying the requirements of degree.

Figure 1.3.
Appendices to Chapter 4: Components of the Macarthur Model for Intervention
Summary

In summary, the primary purpose of this chapter has been to introduce and present diagrammatically an overview of a body of work developed over an extended period of time which underpins new theoretical perspectives and the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in relation to school violence and bullying. Major outcomes of this program of research include:

1. Refining operational definitions of school violence and bullying in order to delineate the responsibilities of school personnel and to serve as a basis for defining the focus of school-based intervention.

2. Identifying new theoretical perspectives that served to inform intervention design including resiliency and advocacy, vulnerability to external influences such as violence viewing, as well as examining the applicability of current child protection legislation in addressing the phenomena in ways which have rarely been suggested elsewhere.

3. Developing a comprehensive model which addresses all identified critical elements of intervention in one manageable and customised approach, delivered consistently and progressively over a reasonable period.

The primary purpose of this research program was to develop a pragmatic and efficient approach to measuring and addressing factors related to bullying and violence within specific school settings as a comprehensive whole-school customised intervention.
CHAPTER 2
Research Methodology, Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the data analyses undertaken to support and validate the theoretical perspectives identified and the model for intervention developed. Firstly the research questions, methodology, instrumentation, procedures and participants are described. Pseudonyms are used for each of the four participating schools to protect confidentiality. Secondly, results pertaining to key constructs are presented for all participants and then separately for participants who identified themselves as students who had experienced bullying. Finally how the results informed the development of new perspectives and a customised approach for intervention is described.

Methodology

Statement of the Problem

To what extent does the frequency, nature, and location of school bullying vary according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of secondary school students? How can intervention best be devised to address the specific needs of each school?

Aims

The study aimed to identify:
1. The nature and frequency of bullying in secondary schools.
2. The extent to which the frequency, nature, and location of school bullying vary according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of secondary school students.
3. Students’ perceptions of and beliefs about school bullying.
4. Students’ perceptions of school locations that were unsafe due to school bullying.
5. New perspectives about bullying that may inform intervention design.
Research Questions

A series of research questions were posed to address the aims of the study. The numbering of research questions corresponds with the numbering associated with each aim of the study.

Research Question 1.1. What is the nature and frequency of school bullying in secondary school contexts?

Research Question 2.1. To what extent does the frequency and nature of school bullying differ according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of secondary school students?

Research Question 2.2. To what extent does the frequency and nature of school bullying differ according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of bullied secondary school students?

Research Question 3.1. What are secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying?

Research Question 3.2. What are bullied secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying?

Research Question 4.1. What school locations do secondary school students’ identify as unsafe due to school bullying?

Research Question 4.2. What school locations do bullied secondary school students’ identify as unsafe due to school bullying?

Research Question 5.1 To what extent can the findings be extrapolated to identify perspectives that may inform intervention?

Research Question 5.2 Is there evidence that a customised approach to intervention is indicated due to school differences?
Instrumentation: The School Safety Survey

The School Safety Survey (see Appendix 2.1) was developed over a period of two years through collaboration with schools in order to identify salient aspects of bullying in relation to their individual school contexts. As an outcome of the process of analysing data, seeking input from school colleagues, and scrutinising the research literature, it became apparent that specific categories of information were particularly useful in providing a clear portrait of the nature and parameters of bullying in a school and could serve to inform intervention. The survey yields both qualitative and quantitative data relating to students’ beliefs, experiences, attitudes and local knowledge about bullying in their schools. The first version of the form was utilised in a regional New South Wales (NSW) co-educational high school in July 1997 and an adapted version was trialed in a private girls’ high school in Queensland later in the same year. This work was undertaken at the request of the schools and was coupled with a one- or two-day education and training in-service for school staff delivered by the researcher. Interactions with school staff during the course of these in-services also contributed to the development of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention (see Chapter 4). Quantitative responses were amalgamated to form a substantial base set of data for wider analysis, as described in this chapter. The qualitative data was school-specific and was reported to schools in their individual reports. For example: questions 6c asks ‘who gets bullied at this school?’ and 6d asked ‘who is a bully at this school?’ Question 9 asks ‘how can we help stop bullying in this school?’ and the responses referred to specific school-based interventions and circumstances which were listed in the individual school reports for the schools to consider.

Specific categories of information are yielded from the survey. Questions 1-3 identify demographic details regarding background information of the respondent including gender, cultural background of students and their parents; and year level.

Question 4 specifies behaviours identified from current literature as typical of those experienced as bullying. In order to establish the intensity and frequency of the behaviours and therefore categorise each student’s status as bullied or non-bullied, a five-point response scale was utilised. Students indicated if each behaviour occurred:
1 - never, 2 - occasionally, 3 - weekly, 4 - most days, or 5 - once or more per day. Since bullying is, by definition, an ongoing persistent behaviour not episodic, this enabled the identification of students for whom bullying was a regular part of their school experience. Students who nominated weekly, most days or once or more per day were categorised as bullied for the purposes of this investigation. Question 5 required students to state the extent to which they viewed school bullying as a problem in the specific school context by utilising a six point response scale that ranged from “1, not a problem” to “6, a major problem”.

Question 6 was designed to elicit students’ responses in relation to bullying situations and their perceptions of students who engaged in or experienced bullying. Question 6a asks students to give a written response indicating what they would do if a friend told them they were being picked on or bullied. Question 6b asks students if they would report bullying to a teacher and provides a yes/no response option. However, because students frequently responded “maybe” or “depends”, these categories of response were included in the final analyses. Question 6c asks students to identify who gets bullied at their school. Question 6d asks students to identify who is a bully at their school. These questions do not ask respondents to identify individuals by name, however this frequently occurred. Names of any individuals (including teachers) identified more than twice as either bullied or a bully were immediately notified to the school in view of child protection legislation. It is interesting to note that teachers were rarely nominated, but were nominated at times in both categories. Participants generally used specific descriptive terms to identify bullies and victims, and their responses clearly indicated the relative social status of both whereby bullies were overwhelmingly described as the “popular” students and victims in a range of derogatory terms.

Question 7 asks if students believe the school “makes students feel good about themselves” and requires a response on a four-point scale from “1 - very few feel good” to “4 - all feel good”. Question 8a asks if students are willing to help somebody they see being bullied. Question 9 asks for suggestions about ways the school can help stop bullying and harassment. Question 10 lists eleven locations in and around the school identified in the literature as implicated in bullying and students were required to indicate any where they believe students feel unsafe.
Students are also asked to nominate any unlisted additional unsafe areas and provide comments about their own experiences. Hence both qualitative and quantitative data was produced as an outcome of completing the instrumentation.

**Participants and Procedures**

The research was undertaken in the greater Sydney metropolitan area, in NSW with a range of schools where bullying was seen as an issue by school administrators. The School Safety Survey was administered to over three thousand high school students in four schools including single-sex, co-educational, denominational, private and state schools over a three year period from 1998 to 2000. These were schools that requested information and assistance concerning bullying in their specific location during the period of this investigation. School 1 (Captain Cook High School) was a metropolitan state co-educational high school, a selective school for sport in northern Sydney \((n = 623)\); School 2 (Mary Immaculate College) was a private Catholic girls' high school in southern Sydney \((n = 780)\); School 3 (Magdalen College) was a private Church of England girls’ high school in southern Sydney \((n = 916)\); and School 4 (St. Barnabas Catholic College) was a Catholic co-ed high school in western Sydney \((n = 964)\). This resulted in a large total sample \((n = 3,283)\) comprising 900 (27.4%) males and 2,383 (72.6%) females (also see Appendix 2.2 for a breakdown of the gender distribution of all participants in each school).

Students were identified as bullied on the basis of their responses to Question 4 of the survey. Appendix 2.3 provides a breakdown of the gender distribution of participants who identified themselves as bullied by school. This table identifies 618 students (18.8%) as bullied of the 3,283 in the total survey population. Question 4 listed nine bullying behaviours with a range of levels of intensity and frequency of experience on a 5-point scale from “never” (1), “occasionally” (2), “weekly” (3), “most days,” (4), “daily or more often” (5). Students who reported they experienced bullying “weekly” (3), “most days” (4), or “daily or more often” (5) in response to any behaviour were classified as bullied. Behaviours were numbered 4.1 to 4.9 whereby

- 4.1 refers to students being bullied by being teased and called names.
• 4.2 refers to students being bullied by receiving comments about their family, country of birth or religion.
• 4.3 refers to students being bullied by being left out or excluded on purpose.
• 4.4 refers to students being bullied by being verbally threatened.
• 4.5 refers to students being bullied by being physically hit, punched or kicked.
• 4.6 refers to students being bullied by being forced to give money or belongings.
• 4.7 refers to students being bullied by receiving comments on their personal appearance.
• 4.8 refers to students being bullied by being touched in ways they do not want to be touched.
• 4.9 refers to students being bullied by deliberate damage to their personal property.

Due to the diverse cultural mix of the survey population, ten categories of Country of Birth (COB) were identified with over twenty separate countries identified in some categories (see Appendix 2.4). For example, students were designated as Eastern European (category 3 of Country of Birth) if they nominated any one of 22 listed Eastern European countries as their country of birth and students were designated as Asian (category 1 of Country of birth) if they nominated any one of 15 Asian countries listed. Appendix 2.5 records the distribution of students in each school by country of birth and indicates that the total population of the survey comprised 88.2% Australian/New Zealand born, 5.6% Asian born and 2.4% European born. All other countries represented each provided less than 1% of the total sample. Appendix 2.6 provides a breakdown of the country of birth of bullied students for each school.

Appendix 2.7 records the year level totals of the population of the survey by school (e.g., St. Barnabas College provided 29.3% of all Year 7 participants) and also indicates the percentage of the survey population enrolled in each year-level ranging from 19.3% in Year 9 to 12.7% in Year 12. This is useful information since the majority of students sampled were in the lower years of high school where
bullying is reportedly particularly prevalent. Appendix 2.8 provides a breakdown of year-level of bullied students for each school. This breakdown of demographic information for each school facilitated close inspection of the characteristics of participants from each school.

Results

The results are presented according to the research questions proposed above.

Results Research Question 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2: Parameters of Bullying

Research Question 1.1 asked, What is the nature and frequency of school bullying in secondary school contexts? Research Question 2.1 asked to what extent does the frequency, nature, and location of school bullying differ according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of secondary school students? Research Question 2.2 asked to what extent does the frequency, nature, and location of school bullying differ according to different school contexts, gender, age, and cultural backgrounds of bullied secondary school students?

Experiences of being bullied. To address these research questions a series of ANOVAs were undertaken to test whether students’ overall experiences of bullying varied as a function of gender, cultural origins, age and specific school. Table 2.1 records the results of the overall F-tests, for all respondents and bullied respondents separately, with the gender, country of birth, year level and school as the independent variables and the mean of all types of bullying as the dependent variable. Table 2.1 indicates that with the exception of year-level (for both all students and for bullied students) all F-tests were significant at least at the .05 level. Thus, students’ overall experiences of bullying varied as a function of their gender, country of birth, and school.
Table 2.1

*F-Tests for the Mean of all Types of Bullying*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>109.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country /birth</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Level</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country /birth</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year level</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the means (see Table 2.2) suggests that for both all students and bullied students, females reported experiencing less bullying than males. In addition, students from other cultural groups reported experiencing more bullying than Australia/New Zealand students. Also students at the two co-educational schools (Captain Cook and St Barnabas) reported experiencing more bullying than students at the other two schools.

As suggested by the overall F-Test in Table 2.1, significant differences with respect to year-level are small or non-existent. Overall, the means in Table 2.2 are low (typically below 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 5) indicating that students did not generally report being greatly bullied, whether they were included in the bullied category or not.
### Table 2.2

**Mean of All Types of Bullying by Gender, Country of Birth, Year and School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Data</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Bullied Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.46$^a$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.30$^b$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/New Zealand</td>
<td>1.32$^a$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1.40$^{ab}$</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.32$^a$</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.50$^b$</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1.32$^a$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>1.35$^b$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>1.32$^a$</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook High School</td>
<td>1.40$^a$</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate Catholic College</td>
<td>1.32$^b$</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican College</td>
<td>1.21$^c$</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Barnabas High School</td>
<td>1.41$^a$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nature of bullying.** Analyses were undertaken to examine, in more detail, responses of students to Question 4 of the School Safety Survey which sought to identify the nature of bullying by examining whether nine specific types of bullying varied as a function of gender, country of birth, year level and school. Firstly, responses of all students are presented, followed by responses of bullied students.

Table 2.3(a) records results of the overall F-test for all students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and gender as the independent variable. This F-test was significant indicating that males and females reported different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up t-tests were used to decompose the overall gender (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. In each case, males reported experiencing more of each type of bullying, with most of the gender differences being significant.

Table 2.3(b) records results of the overall F-test for all students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and country of birth as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that students from different countries reported different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall country of birth (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. Although there are some exceptions, typically students from European and “other” countries reported experiencing more of each type of bullying than Australian and New Zealand students and Asian students. These differences are significant for six of the nine variables.

Table 2.3(c) records results of the overall F-test for all students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and year level as the independent variable. This F-test was not significant, indicating that students at different year levels reported similar experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs indicated few significant univariate differences, with older students, nevertheless, generally reporting experiencing more bullying than the youngest group of students. This is an unexpected result given
current literature in regard to the concentration of bullying in lower years in high school.

Table 2.3(d) records results of the overall F-test for all students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and school as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that students from different schools reported different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall school (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. Although there are some exceptions, typically students from Captain Cook and St. Barnabas schools (both co-educational) reported experiencing more of each type of bullying than students at the other two schools. These differences are significant across all nine variables.

On a more general note, typically differences across gender, country of birth, year level and school for all students with respect to the mean of all types of bullying are reflected with respect to each of the types of bullying taken individually.
Table 2.3(a)

Types of Bullying Experienced by All Students by Gender (N = 3283)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Number</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 900</td>
<td>N = 2383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased or called names</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments on family/relig/country of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punched</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments on looks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched in ways not wanted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property damaged</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p<.05, ** p<.01, .01, *** p<.001.
Table 2.3(b)

Types of Bullying Experienced by All Students by Country of Birth (N = 3283)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>A/NZ M</th>
<th>A/NZ SE</th>
<th>European M</th>
<th>European SE</th>
<th>Asian M</th>
<th>Asian SE</th>
<th>Other M</th>
<th>Other SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased/name-calling</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments/family</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punch</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments on looks</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched not wanted</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property damaged</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (3,3273) = 4.72, p < .003, $\eta^2 = .004$

Note: Reading across the rows of Table 2.3(b), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
Table 2.3(c)

Types of Bullying Experienced by All Students by Year Level (N = 3283)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Year Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (2,3283)=2.45, p&lt;.087, η²=.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased/name-calling</td>
<td>1.80&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments family</td>
<td>1.20&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out on purpose</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punch</td>
<td>1.28&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments/looks</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Reading across the rows of Table 2.3(c), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
### Table 2.3(d)

**Types of Bullying Experienced by All Students by School (N = 3283)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>F(3,3283) = 39.2, p&lt;.001, η²=.035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capt. Cook</td>
<td>Mary Immac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased/name-calling</td>
<td>1.97a</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments family/relig.</td>
<td>1.35a</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out on purpose</td>
<td>1.35a</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.26a</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kicked/punched</td>
<td>1.44a</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.12a</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments /looks</td>
<td>1.66a</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>1.12a</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>1.30a</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.3(d), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
Table 2.4(a) records results of the overall F-test for bullied students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and gender as the independent variable. This F-test was significant indicating that bullied males and females reported different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up t-tests were used to decompose the overall gender (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. Contrary to the parallel analysis for all students, bullied males and females were about equally split in reporting experiencing more of each type of bullying. However, in four of the five cases where gender differences were significant, the differences indicated males reported experiencing more bullying.

Table 2.4(b) records results of the overall F-test for bullied students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and country of birth as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that bullied students from different countries reported somewhat different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall country of birth (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. Only three of the univariate differences are significant, but the pattern of these differences appears more diverse than for the parallel analysis for all students. This suggests that bullied students’ experiences of bullying from school to school may differ somewhat more than school differences for all students.

Table 2.4(c) records results of the overall F-test for bullied students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and year level as the independent variable. This F-test was not significant, indicating that bullied students at different year levels reported similar experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs indicated few significant univariate differences, with experiences of bullying apparently more widely distributed across year levels for bullied students than for all students.

Table 2.4(d) records results of the overall F-test for bullied students with nine types of bullying as the dependent variables and school as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that bullied students from different schools reported different experiences across the nine types of bullying taken as a whole.
Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall school (main) effect with respect to each type of bullying. Although there are some exceptions, typically bullied students from the co-educational Captain Cook and St Barnabas schools reported experiencing more of each type of bullying than students at the other two schools. These differences are significant across seven of the nine variables.

As for the results pertaining to all students, typically differences across gender, country of birth, year level and school for bullied students with respect to each of the types of bullying taken individually reflect differences with respect to the mean of all types of bullying.
Table 2.4(a)

*Types of Bullying Experienced by Bullied Students by Gender (N = 618)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Number</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased</td>
<td>F(1,617) = 6.68, p&lt; .01, η² = .001</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.90**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments /family/religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.68**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.50***</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punched</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.70***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments /looks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p< .05, ** p< .01, *** p< .001.*
Table 2.4(b)

**Types of Bullying Experienced by Bullied Students by Country of Birth (N = 618)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(3,617) = 2.84, p&lt;.037, η² = .014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aust/NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1a</td>
<td>Teased</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments/family</td>
<td>1.71a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out</td>
<td>1.98a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.65a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punched</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments/looks</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Reading across the rows of Table 2.4(c), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
Table 2.4(c)

*Types of Bullying Experienced by Bullied Students by Year Level (N = 618)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased</td>
<td>3.20&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.00&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.90&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments /family/relig/cob</td>
<td>1.63&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.97&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.86&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punched</td>
<td>1.90&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.84&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments /looks</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Reading across the rows of Table 2.4(c), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
Table 2.4(d)

*Types of Bullying Experienced by Bullied Students by School (N = 618)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Capt. Cook</th>
<th>Mary Immac.</th>
<th>Magdalena</th>
<th>St. Barnabas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teased</td>
<td>3.35$^a$</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.80$^b$</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1.94$^a$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.55$^b$</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Left out</td>
<td>1.83$^a$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.14$^b$</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1.80$^a$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.50$^b$</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Hit/kick/punched</td>
<td>2.17$^a$</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.60$^b$</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Forced to give</td>
<td>1.43$^a$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.30$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comments /looks</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1.90$^a$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.90$^a$</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.4(d), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level.
Results Research Question 3.1 and 3.2: Students' Attitudes Towards Bullying

Research Question 3.1 asked what are secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying? Research Question 3.2 asked what are bullied secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying?

A series of ANOVAs similar to those reported above were undertaken to address these research questions. Table 2.5 records the results of the multivariate F-tests for all students with respect to the four questions concerning students’ attitudes towards bullying. In these analyses, there were two independent variables. These were students’ bullied status (i.e., students were designated as either not bullied or bullied), and either their gender, country of birth, year level, or school depending on the analysis. The dependent variables were questions 5, 6b, 7 and 8 from the School Safety Survey. These variables were scored as follows: Question 5, was scored utilising a six point response scale that ranged from “1, not a problem” to “6, a major problem”; question 6b provides a yes/no response option scored as 1 for ‘yes’ and 0 for ‘no’; question 7 requires a response on a four-point scale from “1 - very few feel good” to “4 - all feel good”; question 8a asks if students are willing to help somebody they see being bullied. and is scored as 1 for ‘yes’ and 0 for ‘no’

Table 2.5 indicates a main effect for bullied status for all analyses, a main effect for culture in all but the gender analysis, and an interaction effect for the year analyses. The main effects for bullying indicates that the mean of bullied and non-bullied students’ responses to the attitude questions differed regardless of their gender, country of birth, and school (but not regardless of year because a bully x year interaction effect was present). The main effect for culture indicates that students from different countries and schools answered the four questions differently regardless of whether they were bullied or not. The bully x year interaction effect indicates that both students’ bullied status and their year level simultaneously influenced their responses to each of the four attitude questions. Each of these main and interaction effects is decomposed with respect to the individual questions in Tables 2.6(a–d).
Table 2.5

*F-Tests for Responses by All Students to Questions 5, 6b, 7, and 8 by Gender,*

*Country of Birth, Year Level and School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df²</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Gender</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Country</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3179</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Year</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9537</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x School</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9537</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6(a) records results of the univariate F-tests with gender and bullied status as independent variables. Table 2.6(a) indicates that bullied and non-bullied students’ answers to the first three questions differed regardless of their gender, with bullied students reporting that bullying was more of a problem, and that their school made students feel less good about themselves. Table 2.6(b) records results of the univariate F-tests with country of birth and bullied status as independent variables. Table 2.6(b) indicates that bullied and non-bullied students’ answers to the first and third questions differed regardless of their country of birth, with bullied students reporting that bullying was more of a problem and that their school made students feel less good about themselves. Despite the significant multivariate main effect for country of birth (see Table 2.5), none of the questions taken individually displayed a significant main effect for country of birth.

Table 2.6(c) records results of the univariate F-tests with year-level and bullied status as independent variables. Table 2.6(c) indicates that interaction effects were present for Questions 5 and 7 only. Thus, it is possible to revert to an examination of the main effects for Questions 6b and 8. With respect to these main effects, bullied and non-bullied students’ answers to the second question (6b) differed regardless of their year-level. Also, regardless of their bullied status, students in the middle and higher grades report being more inclined to report bullying to a teacher, with students in the middle grades more inclined to help another student being bullied. The interaction effects indicate that non-bullied students in the middle years (9 and 10) report that bullying is more of a problem than non-bullied students in the younger (7-8) and older years. At the same time, older bullied students report that bullying is less of problem than bullied students in the middle and younger years. Table 2.6(c) also indicates that middle school and older non-bullied students report that their school makes students feel less good about themselves than younger non-bullied students, with the effect most pronounced for middle school students. Bullied students across all grades also reported similar responses to Question 7 across all year levels.

Table 2.6(d) records results of the univariate F-tests with school and bullied status as independent variables. Table 2.6(d) indicates that bullied and non-bullied students’ answers to the first three questions differed regardless of their school,
bullied students reporting that bullying was more of a problem and that their school made students feel less good about themselves. In every case, students' answers to the bullying attitude questions differed across schools regardless of the bullying status of students. This finding suggests that specific school contexts may be a salient influence on students' attitudes towards bullying.
Table 2.6(a)

Responses of All Students (Non-Bullied and Bullied) to Questions 5, 6b, 7, 8 by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>How big a problem is bullying?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6b</td>
<td>Would you report to a teacher?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>Does school help you feel good?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>Would you help someone you saw being bullied?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The boldfaced figures indicate adjacent means that are significantly different at the .001 level.
Table 2.6(b)

**Responses of All Students (Non-Bullied and Bullied) to Questions 5, 6b, 7, 8 by Country of Birth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and#</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia/NZ</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. How big a problem is bullying?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 b. Would you report to a teacher?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Does school help you feel good?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Would you help someone?</td>
<td>Non-bullied</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The boldfaced figures indicate means that are significantly different at the .001 level.
### Table 2.6(c)

*Responses of All Students (Non-Bullied and Bullied) to Questions 5, 6b, 7, 8 by Year Level*

| Var # | Variable Name | Status   | Status | Status | Status | Status | Status | Status | Status | Status | Status |
|-------|---------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|       |               |          | 7-8    | 9-10   | 11-12  | Total  |
|       |               |          | M      | SE     | M      | SE     | M      | SE     | M      | SE     |        |
| Q 5   | How big a problem is bullying? | non-bullied | 2.48a  | .04    | 2.80b  | .05    | 2.60a  | .05    | 2.62   | .03    |        |
|       |               | bullied  | 3.50a  | .09    | 3.64a  | .09    | 3.13b  | .11    | 3.42   | .06    |        |
|       |               |          | total  | 2.98   | .05    | 3.22   | .05    | 2.86   | .06    | 3.02   | .03    |        |
| Q 6b  | Would you report to a teacher? | non-bullied | 1.23   | .02    | 1.51   | .02    | 1.47   | .02    | 1.41   | .01    |        |
|       |               | bullied  | 1.36   | .04    | 1.58   | .04    | 1.60   | .05    | 1.52   | .03    |        |
|       |               |          | total  | 1.30a  | .02    | 1.55b  | .02    | 1.53b  | .03    | 1.46   | .01    |        |
| Q 7   | Does school help you feel good? | non-bullied | 2.76a  | .03    | 2.46b  | .03    | 2.54c  | .03    | 2.60   | .02    |        |
|       |               | bullied  | 2.34   | .05    | 2.20   | .05    | 2.35   | .06    | 2.30   | .03    |        |
|       |               |          | total  | 2.55   | .03    | 2.33   | .03    | 2.45   | .04    | 2.44   | .02    |        |
| Q 8   | Would you help someone you saw being bullied? | non-bullied | 1.18   | .02    | 1.21   | .02    | 1.10   | .02    | 1.16   | .01    |        |
|       |               | bullied  | 1.17   | .03    | 1.30   | .03    | 1.18   | .04    | 1.20   | .02    |        |
|       |               |          | total  | 1.17a  | .02    | 1.23b  | .02    | 1.14a  | .02    | 1.20   | .01    |        |

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.6(c), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the 0.05 level. Reading down the columns of Table 2.6(c) boldfaced figures indicate adjacent means significantly different at .05 level.
Table 2.6(d)

Responses of All Students (Non-Bullied and Bullied) to Questions 5, 6b, 7, 8 by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and #</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Capt. Cook</th>
<th>Mary Immac.</th>
<th>Magdalena</th>
<th>St Barnabas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 How big a problem is bullying?</td>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.40b</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.14b</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.61c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6b Would you report bullying to a teacher?</td>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.36b</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.43b</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.45b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Does school help Make students feel good?</td>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.26b</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.30b</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.63b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Would you help someone you saw being bullied?</td>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.24b</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.22b</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.13b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.6(d), means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the .05 level. Reading down the columns of Table 2.6(d) boldfaced figures indicate adjacent means significantly different at .05 level.
Table 2.7 records the results of the Profile Analysis of not-bullied and bullied students responses to questions regarding students’ attitudes to bullying. Table 2.7 indicates the main effects for group (bullied or not) and question, and the interaction effect (group x question), were all significant. The interaction is of interest in the Profile Analysis. Decomposition of the interaction effect (see Table 2.7) indicates that non-bullied students see bullying as less of a problem than bullied students, and report that their school makes students feel better about themselves than bullied students (hence, the interaction). Both groups of students responded similarly to the last question. The interaction effect is represented diagrammatically in Figure 2.1, which indicates that non-bullied and bullied students have a substantially different profile of answers to the four ‘bullying attitude’ questions.

Table 2.7

*Profile Analysis of Responses to Questions 5, 6b, 7 and 8 (All Students)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Feel Good</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Bullied</td>
<td>2.62a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.40b</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.60c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.46a</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.50b</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.29c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.04w</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.45x</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.44y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.7, means with any identical superscripts are not different at the .05 level. Reading down the columns of Table 2.7, boldfaced means are significantly different from each other at the .05 level.

Main Effect of Group:  
\[ F(1, 617) = 83.77, \ p = .000, \ \eta^2 = .026 \]

Main Effect of Question:  
\[ F(3, 3184) = 1817.89, \ p = .000, \ \eta^2 = 3.63 \]

Interaction Effect (Group x Question):  
\[ F(3, 3184) = 138.18, \ p = .000, \ \eta^2 = .042 \]
Figure 2.1. Profile of non-bullied and bullied students’ responses to four “attitudes about bullying” questions: Attitude 1 (Question 5: How big a problem is bullying?); 2 (Question 6b: Would you tell a teacher?); 3 (Question 7: Does school make you feel good about yourself?); 4 (Question 8: Would you help someone you saw being bullied?).
Results Research Questions 4.1 and 4.2: School as a Safe Environment

Research Question 4.1 asked what school locations do secondary school students' identify as unsafe due to school bullying? Research Question 4.2 asked what school locations do bullied secondary school students' identify as unsafe due to school bullying? These questions refer to responses to question 9 in the survey. A series of analyses similar to those described above was undertaken to address these research questions.

Table 2.8(a) records results of the overall F-test for all students with eleven locations for bullying as the dependent variables and school as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that students from different schools reported that different locations within their school were unsafe. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall school (main) effect with respect to each location of bullying. These ANOVAs indicate that across schools there are differences with respect to the areas that are reported as being unsafe. Thus, each school has a different profile of locations that are considered unsafe by students. These different profiles are represented in Figures 2.2(a) and 2.2(b).

Table 2.8(b) records results of the overall F-test for bullied students with eleven locations for bullying as the dependent variables and school as the independent variable. This F-test was significant, indicating that students from different schools reported that different locations within their school were unsafe. Follow-up one-way ANOVAs were used to decompose the overall school (main) effect with respect to each location of bullying. These ANOVAs indicate that across schools there are differences with respect to the areas are reported a being unsafe by bullied students. Thus, each school has a different profile of locations that are considered unsafe by bullied students. These different profiles are represented in Figures 2.2(a) and (b).
Table 2.8(a)

Responses of All Students to Question 10 ("Which areas of the school do you think students feel unsafe?") by School (N = 3283)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Capt.Cook.</th>
<th>Mary Immac</th>
<th>Magdalena</th>
<th>St. Barnabas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>1.78a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.79a</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>library</td>
<td>1.92a</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.94a</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>hall</td>
<td>1.87a</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.91b</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>corridors</td>
<td>1.61a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.56b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>changrms</td>
<td>1.57a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.75b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>walk/trav</td>
<td>1.58a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.42b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>toilets</td>
<td>1.45a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.54b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>quad</td>
<td>1.72a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.75b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>playgrnd</td>
<td>1.49a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.55a</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>b’ballcrt</td>
<td>1.65a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.88b</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>bus</td>
<td>1.61a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.29b</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Reading across the rows of Table 2.8(a), means with any similar superscripts are not significant at the .05 level.
Table 2.8(b)

*Responses of Bullied Students to Question 10 by School (N = 618)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var #</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>1.69&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>library</td>
<td>1.87&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>hall</td>
<td>1.81&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>corridors</td>
<td>1.53&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>changrms</td>
<td>1.53&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>walk/trav</td>
<td>1.62&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>toilets</td>
<td>1.37&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>quad</td>
<td>1.64&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>playgrnd</td>
<td>1.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>b'ballcrt</td>
<td>1.56&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>bus</td>
<td>1.62&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reading across the rows of Table 2.8(b), means with any similar superscripts are not significant at the .05 level.
Figure 2.2(a). Safety rating by bullied students by school. Means indicate level of safety. High means indicate perceived high safety.

Figure 2.2(b). Safety rating by location by bullied students in each school. Means indicate level of safety. High means indicate perceived high safety.
Discussion

In this section the results are discussed. Discussion relates initially to the results with reference to research questions. Both statistical analyses and descriptive data tables are referred to in the discussion. Appendices provide cross-tabulations and correlations of variables in relation to all students and bullied students with reference to their gender and school attended and are adjunctive to discussion of the statistical tables. Secondly emergent theoretical perspectives and support for the customised model of intervention are discussed. It should be noted that the data are skewed as a consequence of the concentration of female participants and bullied status, however the statistical analyses are robust in relation to assumptions of normalcy.

Parameters of Bullying

The data analyses based upon question 4 of the survey pertaining to types, frequency and intensity of bullying of students indicate that the abuse occurs in all schools sampled, in any year level, and extends to students from a wide range of cultural backgrounds and to both males and females. These results support previous research which has emphasised the pervasiveness of school bullying in a wide range of schools and educational contexts.

Overall students' experiences of bullying varied as a function of their gender, country of birth, and school (see Table 2.1). Interestingly, bullying did not vary significantly as a function of year level. The latter finding is surprising given that previous research (Olweus, 1999; Rigby, 1996; Sullivan, Cleary & Sullivan, 2003) has indicated that younger students in comparison to older students are more frequently bullied. The results of the present investigation suggest that bullying may be more pervasive across year levels than previously thought. This suggestion needs to be elucidated further by future research.

Differential Experiences of Bullying According to Gender

Examination of the means for all types of bullying (Table 2.2) indicates that for all students and bullied students, males reported experiencing more bullying than
females. Males and females also reported different experiences of bullying and in each case, males reported experiencing more of each type of bullying. For all students, males and females reported different experiences of the nine types of bullying, and in each case, males reported experiencing more of each type of bullying, in relation to being teased or called names; inappropriate comments on family, religion or country of birth; being threatened; being hit, kicked or punched; insulting comments on looks; being touched in ways not wanted; and property damaged (see Table 2.3a). These results suggest that teasing and name-calling are frequent types of bullying experienced by all girls and boys but boys are generally more likely to experience physical assault in comparison to girls.

When the results in relation to gender differences for experiences of bullying are examined for bullied students only (see Table 2.4a), the pattern of results becomes more clearly differentiated. Similarly to the results based upon all students, bullied males in comparison to bullied females report statistically significant higher scores as shown in the tables and appended data. In relation to being teased or called names ($M = 3.21$), 64% of bullied males; 53% of bullied females (Appendix 2.9a); reported experiencing this form of bullying. In relation to inappropriate comments on family, religion or country of birth ($M = 2.0$), 26% of bullied males and 17% of bullied females (Appendix 2.9b) reported this behaviour. Additionally, males were twice as likely to report being threatened ($M = 1.84$) with 20.8% of bullied males and 10% of bullied females reporting this experience (see Appendix 2.9d). Physical assaults such as being hit, kicked or punched ($M = 2.33$) also affected 33% of bullied males and 15.7% of bullied females (see Appendix 2.9e).

Male bullied students in comparison to female bullied students are more likely to experience both social and physical forms of bullying. In contrast to the results based upon all students, female bullied students are more likely to experience social exclusion. Furthermore, being excluded or left out on purpose was the only behaviour in which females reported significantly greater involvement ($M = 2.10$) with 25.5% of bullied females and 19.6% of bullied males reporting experiencing this behaviour (see Appendix 2.9c). However, other recent research has shown that boys are equally involved in exclusionary behaviours (Peterson & Rigby, 1999). In addition the non-significant differences between bullied males and females
in relation to being forced to give possessions, insulting comments on looks, being touched in ways not wanted, and property being damaged suggests that bullied boys and bullied girls equally experience these forms of bullying.

Analyses based on all students and bullied students separately allow enriched understandings of the findings. Significant gender differences were also present between schools (see Table 2.3d). Although there are some exceptions, students from the two co-educational high schools (Captain Cook and St. Barnabas) generally reported experiencing more of most types of bullying in comparison to students at the other two schools such that 66% of bullied students at Captain Cook high school are male as are 72% of bullied students at St. Barnabas Catholic College (also see Appendix 2.3). These results suggest that bullying may be more prevalent in co-educational schools than in single sex schools.

**Differential Experiences of Bullying According to Country of Birth**

Country of birth was statistically significant in terms of experiences of bullying for both all students (see Table 2.3b) and bullied students (see Table 2.4b). Table 2.3b indicates that country of birth was significant in terms of experiences of bullying in six of the nine behaviours. Students from countries other than Australia/New Zealand were more likely to report being bullied despite the fact that Australian/New Zealand born students comprised over 80% of the bullied sample (Appendix 2.6). These results suggest that some forms of bullying targeted at non-Australian born cultural groups may be a function of race discrimination in Australia. Table 2.4b indicates that country of birth was also a significant factor in reports of experiences of bullying for bullied students.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

The results presented above in relation to the nature and parameters of bullying revealed a broad range of abusive behaviours, similar to those identified in the child abuse literature. Data gathered clearly supports the notion that young people abuse their peers across a range of psychologically, emotionally and physically damaging behaviours and that these have significant impact. The results provide evidence of the prevalence and impact of nine specific bullying behaviours which are comparable to those viewed as abusive in discussions of child abuse, including physical and verbal abuse, exclusion and threats. Psychological abuse which impacts
on the emotional and social well-being of individuals is a type of abuse which is mandated for reporting by teachers under recent NSW government amendments to legislation. Peer abuse as a legislated child protection issue emerged as an important perspective from consideration of these findings (see Chapter 3 and further discussion below).

Paradoxically, the data collected for this study contradicts the generally held view that females are more likely to be abused than males. While it is certainly statistically evident that young females are more likely to be, in particular sexually abused by adult males (Finkelhor & Hotaling, 1984) the results above suggest that males in secondary schools are more at risk of experiencing a number of forms of bullying. Hence the findings above offer support for the notion of the need to invoke child protection procedures to provide both male and female victimised students with the support they need to resist the abusive behaviour. The results also suggest that particularly in relation to males that interventions may need to be designed to take into account different forms of bullying experienced by different genders.

Name-calling and deliberate tormenting of individuals is unquestionably abusive behaviour which cannot be minimised because of the age or perceived social powerlessness of the victim or the perpetrator. This behaviour is viewed as abusive if perpetrated by adults against children, and it is also dealt with under legislation related to harassment. It cannot therefore be viewed as other than abusive when enacted by one young person against another. Such abusive comments have psychological and emotional impact similar to that experienced in any other verbally abusive relationship and must be acknowledged as such in order to reduce victimisation. This is evidence that students are abused by their peers in ways which are not acceptable and which warrant teacher and school protective intervention. Females are more likely than males to be bullied by exclusion or being left out of things on purpose. While this information has been verified in other studies of bullying, the significance here is that this is a highly abusive behaviour which leads to social isolation, depression and long-term psychological damage when perpetrated by peers to the same extent as when perpetrated by adults in the child’s social milieu. Exclusion is an abusive behaviour in any circumstance and it is suggested here that it falls in the category of child abuse under current legislative provisions. Threats of
harm are also extremely abusive in nature and if perpetrated against a child or spouse by an adult can attract severe legal sanctions including possible imprisonment. Such verbal abuse in peers is equally destructive and frightening and must be viewed as indicative of the need to implement protective procedures for victims. Similarly, in this study physical peer abuse including being hit, kicked or punched is reported and this reinforces the need for vigilance, protective intervention and the possible implementation of child protection procedures.

Overall, all of the listed behaviours were used as a means to abuse students of both genders, from all cultural groups and year-levels in schools to some extent in this study. Support for the need for the implementation and application of the child protection strategies and processes to address this matter is evident. The focus on peer abuse as a child protection issue has rarely been addressed in the literature concerned with bullying in schools. However findings emanating from this investigation imply that teachers and schools may need to be cognisant that their legal obligations to protect students from harm include reporting all forms of abuse—including peer abuse—in the context of child protection legislation procedures in Australian schools.

**Attitudes Towards Bullying**

Findings in relation to questions 5 (How big a problem is bullying?), 6b (Would you tell a teacher?), 7 (Does school make you feel good about yourself?) and 8 (Would you help others you saw being bullied?) suggest that different school contexts impact on student responses and may be a determining factor in students’ attitudes towards bullying. The results clearly show that generally students are aware of bullying by peers, see bullying as a problem, are often willing to report the behaviours, and are willing to help those being bullied.

**Student Perceptions of Bullying** Table 2.6(a) indicates that irrespective of gender, bullied students, as would be expected, viewed bullying as more of a problem that non-bullied students. Of all students surveyed, 87% view bullying as a mild to moderate problem (Appendix 2.10a), while 74% of bullied students saw it as moderate to serious (Appendix 2.10b). In particular, a large majority of bullied students at Captain Cook High school (84.4%) perceived bullying as a moderate to
serious problem (Appendix 2.10a). In addition, bullied students from all categories of
country of origin saw bullying as more of a problem than did non-bullied participants
(see Table 2.6b). Interestingly, older students perceived bullying as less of a problem
than did younger students (Table 2.6c). This may well relate to their maturity and
greater capacity for resilience.

**Intentions to report bullying.** Bullied students are more likely than non-
bullied students to report bullying regardless of gender with 61.6% of all students
prepared to report bullying to a teacher (Appendix 2.10c) and 53.1% of bullied
students also willing (Appendix 2.10d). However, there were significant school
differences in this regard. At St. Barnabas College students generally indicated a
willingness to report with 55% selecting “yes” (Appendix 2.10c) while 54% of
bullied students would not report or were ambivalent about reporting bullying
incidents (Appendix 2.10d). Data from Magdalena Anglican College also indicates
that 63.9% of all students surveyed there would be willing to report (Appendix
2.10c), while 43% of bullied students at this school recorded that they were unlikely
to report bullying or were unsure (Appendix 2.10d).

Bullied students are more likely to report bullying regardless of gender (Table
2.6a), and country of birth (Table 2.6b). Overall bullied students are more inclined to
report bullying to a teacher regardless of year-level. It may seem self-evident that
those experiencing bullying would be more inclined to report bullying they are aware
of, however given their experiences, it would not be surprising if bullied individuals
were very reluctant to report for fear of reprisal. It is encouraging from the
perspective of intervention to see that such students are so inclined to report.

**School climate.** Students’ attitudes towards the school are revealed in their
responses to question 7 which asked if the school helps students feel good about
themselves. Here, the data reveal that non-bullied males and females believe that the
school helps students feel good about themselves (Table 2.6a) to a greater extent than
do bullied individuals. It is also evident that non-bullied students believe the same,
irrespective of country of birth (Table 2.6b) or year-level (Table 2.6c).

In the case of Magdalena Anglican College, 70% of students generally agreed
that the school helps most or all students feel good about themselves and the majority
of students at St. Barnabas College (62%) also believe this is the case (Appendix 2.10e). By comparison, only 48% of bullied students at Magdalena believe that the school helps most or all students feel good, as do 52% of bullied students at St. Barnabas (Appendix 2.10f). Hence the extent to which schools help students to feel good about themselves seems to vary at the individual school level.

**Assisting victims.** When students’ opinions are analysed with respect to helping others they see being bullied (survey question 8), there is no significant difference between bullied and non-bullied students’ responses since 83% of all students would help (Appendix 2.10g) as would 78% of bullied students (Appendix 2.10h). Students at Captain Cook High school were the least willing and most ambivalent about helping with 22% responding “no” or “maybe/depends” (Appendix 2.10g). At Magdalena Anglican students were most inclined to help with 89% of all students (Appendix 2.10g) and 87% of bullied students responding “yes” (Appendix 2.10h). Students in the middle grades seemed more inclined to help (Table 2.6c).

**Implications for research and practice.** In summary, bullied and non-bullied participants have different opinions regarding the seriousness of the problem, their willingness to report, and the capacity of the school to help them feel good (see Figure 2.1 for an illustration of the different profiles of bullied and non-bullied students in their responses to the four attitudes questions). The data presented here provide results which validate the need for peer intervention. As a result of scrutinising these findings, Peer Advocacy was identified as an important specific new approach to intervention (see Appendix 3.9, Chapter 3). Fundamentally, the concept proposed is that Peer Advocacy draws upon the willingness and capacity of peers to intervene on behalf of those being bullied utilising new skills for interaction and assistance. It also addresses the negative and unsupportive attitudes towards victims often expressed by non-victimised peers. Since the results of the present investigation indicate that all students are concerned about the seriousness of bullying as a problem in their school, Peer Advocacy is proposed as a promising means by which the problem can be recognised, explored and addressed.

The present investigation indicated that students are willing to report bullying they are aware of to a teacher. Peer Advocacy provides a mechanism for undertaking this task in a way which can be legitimised through school procedures and sanctions.
The reporting behaviours of students are a critical dimension of intervention and it is imperative that individual schools devise appropriate and secure reporting mechanisms for bullied students in their milieu. Additionally, peers of bullied students are positive about the capacity of the school to help students feel good and this is an attitude well suited to Peer Advocacy training. Survey results also reveal that all students and bullied students are already willing to offer help to those they saw being bullied. The latter is a positive indicator that the Peer Advocacy intervention would be useful in formalising processes for assisting others.

Students’ written comments seemed to indicate that peers who are “fighting” should be able to take care of themselves and therefore would not require help. This is a common misconception in regard to interpreting bullying behaviours which can be addressed in a Peer Advocacy training program (see Chapter 3). Nevertheless, willingness to help others is a key indicator that Peer Advocacy training to formalise the support would be useful. Hence the results of the study would seem to validate the need for the support of willing peers in partnership with the victim of bullying through the Peer Advocacy process since peers may need to take the initiative to intervene on behalf of those being bullied. There is clear support for the training and mentoring of both bullied and non-bullied students in a systematic supportive intervention such as Peer Advocacy, established within a supportive school environment.

Students in the general population of the survey also expressed in their written responses clearly negative and rejecting attitudes towards victims using a range of derogatory terms to describe them. Examination of responses indicates that victims of bullying are often viewed as being in some way deserving of the bullying because of their obvious social incompetence, unattractiveness and lack of personality. Many respondents viewed students who were “different” in unspecified ways as targets for bullying and lack of popularity and the consequent lack of friends was also seen as indicative. Ethnicity was also seen as relevant and other attributing factors included poor self-esteem and personal attributes. Bullies on the other hand were described overwhelmingly as “popular” throughout the large sample of data gathered. They were also described as having lots of friends, being smart and attractive with high self-esteem and consequent high social status. The overall
impression gained from examination of these responses is that without the support of carefully inducted peers whose attitudes towards those being victimised had been addressed systematically, there is little hope for the safety and well-being of victims of bullying. Peer Advocacy addresses these concerns.

Evidence from the present investigation was also found to support the concept that there are differences in the resiliency of individuals in their responses to bullying behaviour. The responses of girls to bullying was examined more closely as they formed the majority of participants in the survey. Results of this inspection suggested that female individuals who were bullied nevertheless did not view the behaviour as a serious problem, whereas others revealed a greater degree of disaffection. A paper was presented at British Education Research Association conference in 2002 which related to cultural differences in girls’ resiliency to bullying (Healey, 2002b, Appendix 3.7). Tables included in the paper record responses across the types and intensity of bullying and girls’ responses to other relevant survey questions. The paper discusses the percentage of girls from each cultural group who experienced the type of bullying listed and provides evidence of the intensity of the bullying endured. It is clear that for some cultural groups, girls reported experiencing all of the listed behaviours, while for others only some of the behaviours were evident. Hence the results yielded some apparently contradictory findings that may be explained by cultural differences in girls’ resiliency to bullying.

It would seem reasonable to expect that those students who are seriously bullied in school would view the matter as a serious or major problem and would be willing to report the behaviours and assist others they saw being bullied. It would also seem reasonable that they would believe that experiencing such behaviours in the school would mean that the school does not help students feel good. Nevertheless, these respondents did not view bullying as a serious or major problem and felt that some or most students felt good about themselves at school. They were willing to assist and to report in regards to bullying, but the overall cumulative impression revealed in the data is that their own experiences of bullying had not impacted on their views about school or on their appropriate functioning. This seems to support the notion of resiliency in the face of the adverse experience of bullying. It
could also, however, indicate a greater tolerance of bullying as an expected behaviour while at school.

The findings of the present investigation provide support for the view that there are qualitative differences in the responses of bullied individuals in terms of impact. The most salient explanation for this is that some individuals respond with resilience to the abuse, in that they continue their lives with little outward evidence of trauma. Others respond with a degree of hopelessness and see their world as dominated by the bullying episodes. The research base for the suggestion that bullied individuals be trained in the development or demonstration of resiliency is implicated by these analyses.

Differential Experiences and Perceptions of Bullying According to School

For intervention to be successful it is essential to document thoroughly the idiosyncratic nature of the specific population of students in terms of their experiences of, attitudes towards and beliefs about bullying in their own schools. The results presented above support the notion that it is essential to devise a customised intervention based on local school issues and problems in order to address bullying. There is evidence that for each school, student perceptions differ with regard to experiences of bullying. A different profile of, types of bullying, attitudes and willingness to assist others and unsafe areas emerges through the data analyses for each school. Customised bullying intervention can be facilitated by a willingness of schools to accede to widespread data collection and to commit to intervention based on the results.

The results discussed in this section of the chapter focus upon the systematic documentation of bullying in the participating schools which led subsequently to a model for customised intervention. The findings of the present investigation revealed significant differences between the schools in terms of the spread and frequency of reported bullying behaviours and students' responses to the problem. These differences prescribe the focus of intervention for each location. It is clear that a generic approach which ignores the major problem areas identified in the particular setting is unlikely to be successful, since students will be disinclined to support an intervention which appears to discount their specific concerns.
**School differences in parameters of bullying.** Students from different schools reported significantly different experiences of bullying across the nine behaviours examined in the present investigation (Table 2.3d). This table also shows that students from co-educational high schools were more likely to have experienced bullying. Appendix 2.3 illustrates the extent to which students in co-educational high schools in this study are more likely to be bullied. For example, students in St. Barnabas Catholic College comprised 38% of the total bullied sample and Captain Cook High School comprised 25%. It is also clear from this appendix that males in co-educational settings were much more likely to be bullied with 72% of bullied students at St. Barnabas Catholic College being male and 66% at Captain Cook. Table 2.4d records the experiences of bullied students across the nine behaviours and indicates significant differences between schools in seven of the nine behaviours. This indicates that intervention at these schools would need to take into account the differing levels of victimisation for males and females. There is a significant correlation between the school attended and gender of bullied student.

**Year-level differences in specific schools.** Significant differences between year levels of students at each school and their experiences of bullying were present. At Captain Cook High School, Year 9 students reported most bullying (29% of bullied students), at Mary Immaculate College, Year 7 students reported most bullying (27% of bullied girls), at Magdalena Anglican Ladies College, Year 10 reported most bullying (22% of bullied girls); whereas at St. Barnabas Catholic College, bullying was fairly evenly distributed across all year groups. In each of these individual locations, therefore, the form of intervention would need to acknowledge the concentration of bullying in particular year groups and offer support and instruction for those specific cohorts of students.

**Gender differences in specific schools.** Additionally, differences in relation to the types of bullying experienced by males and females were found to vary in relation to the specific school context (Appendices 2.9a–d). These results also imply there is a need for vigilant and targeted intervention which acknowledges the specific school profile.
School differences in attitudes towards bullying. In every case students’ responses to the questions related to attitudes towards bullying differed irrespective of their bullied status (Table 2.6d). Appendix 2.10b indicates significant correlations in bullied students’ evaluations of the seriousness of the problem of bullying in their school. In all schools the majority of bullied students viewed the problem as moderately severe with a significant proportion indicating it as a serious problem. Each school therefore needs to recognise and address bullied students’ concerns about the seriousness of the problem, even though the majority of students surveyed in each location did not view the problem as serious, evidently since they were not personally effected. For example, data from Magdalena Anglican school indicates that 63% of the general school population surveyed saw bullying as not a problem to a mild problem (Appendix 2.10a) whereas 70% of bullied students there saw bullying as a moderate to severe problem (Appendix 2.10b). Data from St. Barnabas Catholic College also indicated that 42% of the general population surveyed saw bullying as not a problem to a mild problem (Appendix 2.10a), whereas 70.9% of bullied students viewed it as moderate to severe (Appendix 2.10b). The legitimate concerns of bullied students at individual schools obviously need to be addressed to ensure protection from victimisation.

School differences in willingness to report bullying. As discussed earlier significant differences are also shown in the willingness of bullied individuals to report bullying to a teacher and this further indicates a need for a customised school intervention. There were significant school differences in this regard. At St. Barnabas College students generally indicated a willingness to report with 55% selecting ‘yes’ (Appendix 2.10c) while 54% of bullied students would not report or were ambivalent about reporting bullying incidents (Appendix 2.10d). Data from Magdalena Anglican College also indicates that 63.9% of all students surveyed there would be willing to report (Appendix 2.10c)and while 43% of bullied students recorded that they were unlikely to report bullying or were unsure (Appendix 2.10d.) the majority of bullied students there would report. Bullied students are more likely to report bullying regardless of gender (Table 2.6a), and country of birth (Table 2.6b). Overall bullied students are more inclined to report bullying they are aware of to a teacher regardless of year level. It may seem self-evident that those experiencing bullying would be more inclined to report bullying they are aware of, however given
their experiences it would not be surprising if bullied individuals were very reluctant to report for fear of reprisal. It is encouraging from the perspective of intervention to see that such students are so inclined.

**School differences in capacity to make students feel good**

Students' attitudes towards the school are revealed in their responses to question 7 which asked if the school helps students feel good about themselves. Here the data reveal that non-bullied males and females believe that the school helps students feel good about themselves (Table 2.6a) to a greater extent than do bullied individuals. It is also evident that non-bullied students believe the same irrespective of country of birth (Table 2.6b) or year level (Table 2.6c).

There are significant differences between schools in terms of their perceived capacity to maintain student self-esteem. In the case of Magdalena Anglican College 70% of students generally feel that the school helps most or all students feel good about themselves and the majority of students at St Barnabas College (62%) also believe this is the case (Appendix 2.10e). By comparison only 48% of bullied students at Magdalena believe that the school helps most or all students feel good as do 52% of bullied students at St. Barnabas (Appendix 2.10f).

The majority of bullied students at Mary Immaculate College felt that the school made very few or only some students feel good about themselves while at Magdalena Anglican College very few respondents felt the school was lacking in this. (Appendix 2.10f). It is apparent that for these schools there is a significant difference in student perceptions about the capacity of the school to offer support and that intervention for the particular school would need to focus on improvement in this area, or formalisation or maintenance of the current supportive structures.

**School differences in willingness to assist victims.** Further evidence of the necessity for a customised intervention is provided in the responses to question 8 regarding the willingness of students to assist others they saw being bullied. While bullied students across each school were almost equally willing to help, bullied students at Captain Cook High were least willing and most ambivalent with 27% selecting “no” or “maybe/depends”. On the other hand, Magdalena Anglican bullied student responses indicated that only 12% were unwilling or ambivalent. These
students feel more inclined to offer assistance and this could be related to their relatively more positive perception of the amount of support available within the school. This indicates a need for an intervention for each participating school which encourages and trains students to utilise school resources in the event of witnessing others being bullied. Some schools evidently already have protocols which facilitate or support students in this regard.

_School differences in perceived unsafe areas._ Differences were evident in student perceptions of school areas which were unsafe. Each school had a different profile of locations that were considered unsafe by students (Table 2.8a; also see Figures 2.2a and 2.2b). Appendix 2.11 also demonstrates some of these differences. For example, bullied students at Captain Cook High school are far less likely to feel safe in the toilets with 62% expressing this concern. On the other hand, only 21% of bullied students at St. Barnabas Catholic College indicate their concern in this regard. Indeed the majority of bullied students at Magdalena Anglican (69%) and St. Barnabas Catholic College (79%) feel safe in this area. Similarly, there were differences between schools in student perceptions of playground safety. In both Mary Immaculate (61%) and Captain Cook (61%) the majority of bullied students felt the playground was unsafe, while at Magdalena (59%) and St Barnabas (66%) the majority of bullied students felt safe in the playground (see Appendix 2.11b). Perhaps supervision is addressed differently at different schools or perhaps there are differences in the availability of separate spaces for students to engage in recreational activities.

A large majority of bullied students at Mary Immaculate College were most concerned about bus travel (80%) as were 51% of bullied students from Magdalena College (Appendix 2.11c). Appendix 2.11d also indicates that there are significant differences between males and females in their experiences travelling by bus to and from school. The majority of bullied males feel safe on the bus (60%), while the majority of females do not (62%). This information relates in some part to the different modes of transport available to students. While students from Magdalena and Mary Immaculate utilised public transport in and around the city of Sydney, students from the other two schools used local suburban bus networks. It could be that the smaller local services offer some measure of protection for students, or that
members of the community take some responsibility for monitoring or intervening in bullying behaviours on local buses. These results suggest that some schools need to consider means to monitor student behaviour while travelling between home and school. Overall the results indicate that areas identified as unsafe vary from school to school. These results imply that it is vital for intervention to address the specific identified needs in the school.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of a research program undertaken as a component of the present investigation. Fundamentally, this information was used for three specific purposes. Firstly, results were used to produce substantial research reports for three of the four participating schools who requested this information. Secondly the results of data analysis served to inform the consideration of new theoretical perspectives that are the focus of Chapter 3. Thirdly, research results underpinned the development and implementation of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention discussed in Chapter 4.

Additionally, empirical studies based upon this data are reported in “Bullying of Asian Students” (Jenkin, 1999, Appendix 4.1.6) and “Adolescents’ Experiences, Perceptions and Attitudes Related to Bullying” (Healey et al., 2003, Appendix 4.1.7). Several new theoretical perspectives emerged as an outcome of reviewing student responses in this research program. Initially, the parallels between peer abuse and child abuse led to consideration of child protection legislation and procedures as a legitimate intervention in bullying for schools. Students’ comments indicating a lack of empathy for victims and a distorted view of the high social status of bullies underpinned the formulation of the Peer Advocacy program which requires an extensive level of peer support, responsibility and commitment towards peers. Subsequently, the range of students’ responses in terms of their views about the impact of the problem led to consideration of the resiliency literature and its relevance in the development of resistance skills in relation to bullying. Evidence was also presented to indicate that there are significant differences between schools across a range of behaviours, student attitudes and unsafe locations in the reported views and experiences of bullied students at each school. The identification of these
differences in specific educational contexts led to the development of a customised approach to intervention since, unless the specific, identified and statistically verified problem areas within the particular domain are addressed, intervention will be a wasted opportunity for change. Hence the results presented in this chapter have informed the development of new theoretical perspectives and a comprehensive approach to intervention both of which are fully discussed in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3

New Theoretical Perspectives on Violence and Bullying in Schools

Introduction

In this chapter the background to each new perspective identified during the course of the present program of research is discussed as it pertains to pragmatic experiences of the author as a teacher and researcher in educational settings from schools to correctional facilities. A discussion of literature relevant to each perspective and current issues revealed during the course of the program of research is undertaken to illustrate the significance of the perspective. Implications of each perspective for the present research program in terms of impact and outcomes produced are addressed.

Background

A thorough examination of current research and literature in the several fields of investigation for this research program provided the initial basis for the development of the theoretical perspectives presented. As can be seen in following sections of this chapter, each perspective is discussed in relation to the literature relevant to the particular issue. The importance of the extant literature is further apparent in the appended research products that address each perspective in more detail. In 2003, the perspectives were presented at the Australia and New Zealand Research in Education Conference in Auckland in a paper which discussed them as representing a broadening of our understanding of the psychology of peer abuse (Healey, 2003c, see Appendix 3.11). This paper was a culmination of the consideration of the perspectives over a long period of time. In addition, the analysis of data gathered in the process of research with four high schools contributed substantially to the formulation of these new theoretical perspectives.
Initially, the concept of Resolving Violence through Education developed as an outcome of a strong international focus on violence and its social implications over the early period of the program. As the origins and causal factors for the phenomenon were sought, re-interpreting current theory regarding the impact of violence viewing followed. Hence the inclusion of the perspective Challenging the Perception that Violence-Viewing Influences Young People to Engage in Violence. Quantitative research was a natural outcome of this preliminary work. As the emphasis shifted over time, internationally and locally, to a focus on the psychology and impact of bullying in society generally and particularly in schools and with young people, data was gathered to investigate the parameters and nature of the phenomena in local schools. The large set of data discussed in Chapter 2 yielded evidence in support the formulation of three further new perspectives: Peer abuse as a child protection issue; Resiliency as a critical skill for resisting bullying; and Peer Advocacy as a functional response to peer abuse. These perspectives are new in that they have rarely been mentioned in the literature in relation to bullying. As such, they provide indicators for future intervention and re-interpretations of current knowledge.

The conceptualisation of bullying as a child protection issue and the possibility of using current legislation as a protective intervention emerged during the latter stage of the research. Bullying behaviours were found to correlate closely with child abuse data. A pedagogical model for simulating the acquisition of attributes such as resiliency, previously considered developmental, also developed in light of the data in relation to variations in student responses to bullying. Cultural and gender differences in the interpretation of, and tolerance for peer abusive behaviours were also found based on analysis of the data set. Furthermore, analysis of the data revealed that bullies seemed to hold an elevated social status, that peers were, in general, unsympathetic towards victims and that often bullying was facilitated by unsupportive or uninformed authorities. From these findings the concept of Peer Advocacy developed and the social imperative of using this specific strategy to address peer abuse unfolded. The critical factor in peer abuse or bullying is obviously peer attitudes and behaviours and the most potent intervention is therefore, of necessity, peer-focused. Perspectives pertaining to violence in schools developed
as an outcome of pragmatic teaching experiences, literature reviews and professional development in Australia and overseas early in the program of research and had a qualitative focus.

**Resolving Violence Through Education**

**Background**

In the initial period of the research program described in this portfolio there was broad community interest in determining the extent and nature of violence in schools and society and the role of educators in addressing this issue. The personal interest of the author in this issue was intense due to the experience of having a student murdered in a violent incident and having developed, over a number of years a prototype curriculum for use in Australian schools It became apparent that further investigation was warranted. A plethora of "violence prevention" programs were available in the United States during this period. Subsequently, an extensive program of professional visits to programs and organisations offering curricular and community interventions throughout the USA, Canada and the UK was arranged and undertaken in the context of professional development leave in 1995 (see Appendix 4.2.1). The purpose of this activity was to examine, in situ through interactions with program providers and clients, the impact, outcomes and processes of violence prevention programs. It was felt that this experience could also provide the evidence for efficacy and direction for the evaluation of the Australian curriculum. In fact, if violence is indeed a learned behaviour as theorists have consistently suggested (Bandura, 1973; Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs 1998; Sutherland, 1947), the empirical evidence for such a view should enable us to develop and implement responsive interventions based on appropriate pedagogy. That is, we ought to be able to teach pro-social and anti-violence behaviours and attitudes. (Goldstien et al., 1998).

An extensive program of presentations, conferences and community forums was also undertaken during this period in Australia and overseas as the notion of resolving violence through education gained in popularity and became a feasible curricular focus for schools. Prior to this, the National School Safety Journal had in Fall 1994 published a short article emanating from this program entitled "Coping with Violence in Australian Schools" (Jenkin, 1994, see Appendix 3.1). This
publication serves to illustrate that the model developed during the course of this research (see Chapter 4) was in an embryonic state at this early stage and continued to develop with subsequent work. In 1995, the Australian Council for Educational Research accepted for publication what was to be the first anti-violence curriculum in Australia: “Resolving Violence—An Anti-Violence Curriculum for Secondary Students” (Jenkin, 1996, see Appendix 4.5.1; discussed in detail in Chapter 4). The curriculum has an anti-violence, pro-social focus and incorporates a wide range of innovative educational activities which are seen as highly appropriate and motivating for the secondary student populations to which it is delivered. This publication has had broad and international distribution since 1996 and continues to be widely utilised. It is important to note that the curriculum does not claim to be violence “preventative” in the short-term. Rather, it is an educative program devised to impart information and knowledge about the origins of violence, and to teach skills and strategies for resolving and avoiding violence in interpersonal relationships. In this sense it had quite a different focus from those available at the time overseas, and represented a new and possibly more achievable direction for intervention. This factor, discussed in more detail below, in all probability has contributed to sustaining it in publication since 1996.

Later in 1995, a request was received to present a keynote address at the first special education conference to consider the issues of violence in schools (Jenkin, 1995a, see Appendix 3.2). This paper entitled “Resolving Violence Through Education” provided the opportunity to explore publicly in Australia the notion of education programs to develop non-violent behavioural responses and for providing insight into the range of approaches currently offered in other countries. In 1996, only a short time after the Port Arthur massacre in Tasmania, the grounding philosophy for the concept of resolving violence through education was presented at the Australian Council for Educational Research national conference on behaviour management in Hobart (Jenkin, 1996c, see Appendix 3.3) to an audience shocked by recent events and receptive to the theory being propounded.
Discussion and Significance

Discourse over recent years with regard to violence has centred on its origins, its functions and its location within the psyche of the individual. Theories attempting to explain and define the origins of violence as intra-individual and psychological or socio-cultural and environmental each fail to offer a complete definition because, in all likelihood, these elements are all contributory.

Bowie (1991) discusses a wide range of explanatory factors relating to psychopathology, genetic and biological determinants, social learning, environmental and macro system sources of violent orientations and behaviours. Factors suggested also include gender as the key contributor, and some argue, a causal factor (Egger, 1995; Scutt, 1995; Wallace, 1995), individual psychology, and sociological influences (Patterson, Littman & Bricker, 1987). All of these factors need to be considered in any intervention that attempts to teach the resolution of violence through an educative process, as their impact can also prescribe outcomes. One noticeable feature in many of the programs examined overseas was the gender neutrality of the content and presentation format (Oram, 1995). There was little attempt to acknowledge differences in males’ and females’ involvement in, and experiences of violence. This issue is addressed in the curriculum devised in this portfolio in that the program has deliberately been designed to identify gender-based needs and differences in dealing with violence and was designed to be presented to both gender segregated and joint groups to facilitate relevant skills acquisition.

A challenging concept for those engaged in violence intervention and prevention is that violence is not necessarily “provoked”, but deliberately embraced by certain individuals. Goldstein et al. (1998) refer to “aggression addiction—a long-term, repetitively used, stable behaviour” (p. 8). When negative and anti-social experiences are more readily available at critical moments of developmental receptivity, learning of such behaviours will nevertheless take place. These researchers also believe aggressive or violent behaviour is typically learned behaviour: “For many youths, its teaching is repetitive, its success is frequent, its rewards are generous and its punishments are few” (p. 1). Some individuals will choose violence on a regular or episodic basis to deal with conflict or for self-gratification, but the motivation for such responses is a question for psychiatry. Some
individuals enjoy the power and prefer to use their violent urges and capacities to
their own advantage. Rapists, for example, do not use sexual violence in anger, but to
satisfy their urges for domination (Scutt, 1995). Similarly, child abusers are
systematic and careful in their planning and perpetration of violence against children
(Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994).

Attempting to rehabilitate someone who has so obviously been excluded from
the usual socialisation processes may well prove financially and psychologically
impossible and beyond the scope of such programs as are suggested here.
Nevertheless, the notion that violence can be resolved through education is an
attractive philosophical proposition. It empowers us to shape environments to
prevent destructive acts and to reconstruct individual behavioural orientations to
ensure our safety. The proposal here is that the application of an educative anti-
violence program coupled with a thorough individual intervention to teach new and
appropriate behaviours and orientations is the most promising approach to
intervention in violence in schools and society. A critical issue raised was the
measurement of the efficacy of such programs in actually preventing or reducing
violence in schools and in the behaviours of young people.

**Objectives and Efficacy of Violence Prevention Programs**

The preferred approach in violence intervention programs developed overseas
at this during the period of this investigation was “violence prevention”. It is not
surprising, therefore, that evaluations of the efficacy of such interventions
demonstrate little or no impact in that such interventions could not be readily
demonstrated to prevent violence. The problem lies in the selection of the program
emphasis and objectives. Violence cannot be prevented in the short-term, and
certainly not in the short-term offered by a classroom curriculum. Indeed, two studies
in Canada demonstrated an increase in reported violence following implementation
of commercially available violence prevention programs—in one case a rise of 47%
was recorded (Artz, 1996). This indicates, in all probability that increased reporting
results from the raising of awareness due to the program. The majority of participants
remained non-violent as they were before the program, and those who are violent
continued to engage in violent acts despite the program. This critical factor validates
the educative rather than preventative emphasis in intervention design. Most program
participants are not violent and would not become so even without the program. A clear distinction must be drawn between violence prevention and anti-violence initiatives in terms of their objectives, content and impact. Only long-term socialisation and education processes will help prevent violence, as is already the case for most members of society. Social competency, empathy, dispute resolution, anger management and mediation are all skills usually developed over the years to maturation (King, 1995). For those who do not develop these skills, discrete and specific programs are offered to precipitate or induce their acquisition. Goldstein and his colleagues in particular have been influential in securing credibility for the impact and effectiveness of specific interventions for aggression reduction. The Aggression Replacement Training intervention devised by Goldstein et al. (1998) has served many hostile youth as has their work with school-based gangs in the USA.

There is an element of precipitation in the intent of these types of programs to develop social skills in young people. They seem to hold the expectation that young people will be able to demonstrate interaction skills at a much more sophisticated level than would have been expected even a decade ago. Violence is already prevented by social processes which reject overt violence within the social milieu. The purpose of such programs therefore is to reinforce and extend socially transmitted attitudes and behaviours. Episodic violence such as that experienced in school settings overseas cannot be prevented by this approach. However, violence prevention programs, which are, in effect, anti-violence programs, can prepare students to recognise and resist pro-violent attitudes and behaviours in their peers.

In the USA, hundreds of programs were offered as “violence prevention” protocols during this early period of research and the advanced state of intervention was very evident. Most programs were aimed at males 10-15 years old who were seen to be most at risk for being either a victim or perpetrator of a violent act. Cohen and Wilson-Brewer (1991) conducted a meta-evaluation of state-of-the-art violence prevention programs with a view to determining efficacy and future directions for funding and development. Programs ranged from conflict and dispute resolution to mediation and gang prevention initiatives. All of these programmes were described as violence prevention programmes and included a stated purpose of violence prevention. Their findings indicated that only 21% of programs they
investigated conducted outcomes evaluation. Another 39% relied upon participant feedback only, while 16% did no evaluation at all. Hence quantitative evidence of efficacy was rare.

Wilson-Brewer, Cohen, O’Donnell and Goodman (1991) identified several programs offering promise. What differentiated these from the former programs was a skills-based emphasis which incorporated measurable objectives. For example, Beland’s (1989) Second Step Program offered teacher training as well as a curriculum focused on conflict resolution skills acquisition. Evaluations of the “Paramount Plan” anti-gang program in California (Ostos, 1993) demonstrated that 98% of participants at 12-month follow-up were still familiar with the content of the program. Hence it was apparent that programs which had specific and measurable behavioural outcomes, as opposed to simply attitudes development or a preventative focus, were more likely to be successful in achieving specified results. These research findings reinforced the focus of the Australian curriculum which had been designated an “anti-violence” program from the outset.

Goldstein, Harootunian and Conoly (1994) published an extensive list of student, school and systems-oriented interventions. However, none of these seemed to simultaneously address all of the facets which were to eventually form part of the model described further in this portfolio. Based on the above research findings, it was seen that methodologies for replacing violence that comprise knowledge and skills for the reinforcement and revision of socially acceptable behaviours and attitudes needed to be developed for the Australian context and applied widely. Anti-violence programs such as the one included in this portfolio do not claim to be preventative. The focus of the curriculum is to provide education about the origins and impact of violence and strategies for resistance and avoidance. It aims to change pro-violent attitudes and deliver gender relevant information and skills.

The perspective of resolving violence through education has now been sustained over a significant period of time and is recognised as a legitimate focus for intervention in violence in schools. This perspective emerged as an outcome of close collaboration with colleagues overseas that resulted in the focus of the curriculum developed by the author being quite different to that of other programs in that it is
educative in focus rather than preventative. As such the efficacy of the newly developed intervention also needed to be measured in quite a different manner. The focus of the newly developed program was skills and knowledge acquisition in relation to the origins and impact of violence, and gender-differentiated strategies for dealing with violence. It was not relevant to validate or to measure efficacy in preventing violence since the focus was educational. It was more relevant to measure the changes in knowledge levels and attitudes for participants. Several measures for evaluation were included in the program and applied to specific groups of participants.

**Implications for the Present Investigation**

While current theories about the origins of violence, in particular the educative power of the violence media, need further evaluation, the thesis that violent behaviours can be learned and that therefore violent behaviours can be replaced with new learning is fundamental to this portfolio of research and intervention. The statistical evidence clearly demonstrates that the majority of people in society are already well in control of their violent urges and that violence is a relatively rare and aberrant occurrence (Mukherjee & Dagger, 1990; Weatherburn, 1990). Hence the problem for educators has been to discover the process by which this level of control develops.

In terms of the present investigation it was apparent that internationally, an educative process was generally accepted as a feasible and indeed imperative approach to resolving violence in society (Adair, Dixon, Moore & Sutherland, 2000; Kavanagh & Hopps, 1994; Prothrow-Stith, 1987; Spatz-Widom, 1995). Cognisance of the possibility that violence is actually the preferred mode of interaction for some individuals is also relevant to successful intervention. Early intervention is critical, as are remedial response initiatives that recognise violent behaviours as indicative of a need for re-education rather than merely punishment. Re-education is an appropriate descriptor for the approach needed since there has often been thorough and systematic teaching of violent behaviours in the life experience of violent individuals. It is not unreasonable therefore, to concede that the efficacy of the program of intervention proposed in this portfolio may have been severely limited even if delivered early in the life of a committed violent offender.
and we must accept that despite the best efforts and practices of professionals in the field that the psychology of some individuals is beyond our powers of reparation. Such interventions have their limitations. However it was deemed useful that methodologies for replacing violence that comprise knowledge and skills for the reinforcement and revision of socially acceptable behaviours and attitudes be developed and applied widely.

Challenging the Perception that Violence-Viewing Influences Young People to Engage in Violence

Background

During the process of investigating the nature and parameters of bullying and violence in schools, current literature related to the impact of violence viewing was examined. Violence viewing is commonly reported as a precipitous factor in the development of aggressive behaviour (Biggins, 1997; Bjornebekk, 1998). However, it is proposed here that for the most part, previous research has been inaccurate in suggesting that violence viewing is causal and instructive in the development of aggression. It is an important conceptualisation since violent and bullying behaviours must be attributed to other origins if violence viewing is eliminated as a cause. The paper entitled “Rambo Made Me Do It: Perceptions of the Influence of Media Violence on Young People and Children and Their Involvement in Crime” (Jenkin, 1998, see Appendix 3.4) was offered in 1998 at the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference in the category of youth criminology. It was written to present a critical analysis of early and current research which attempted to establish a causal link between the types and amount of violence viewed and the consequent behaviour of young people. Evidence of a clear link would provide a ready solution for preventing violent behaviour. If indeed the link is empirically demonstrable there could be no valid excuse for refusing to withdraw all offending products with the expectation of a subsequent reduction in the incidence of violent behaviour. However, despite a prevailing community perception that viewing violence influences young people to engage in violent behaviour (Arnow, 1995; Ballard & Weist, 1995; Irwin & Gross, 1995), attempts to establish a causal link between the types and amount of violence viewed and the consequent behaviour of young viewers have been unimpressive.
Violence viewed in research studies is often simulated rather than real. Failure to differentiate real from simulated violence in experimental, observational and analytical studies lies at the foundation of this mistaken belief. Violence-viewing may have little or no impact unless socialisation processes that reinforce enacting violent behaviour accompany such viewing. Such a re-definition of previously accepted perspectives is important in terms of this portfolio of work. Violent and bullying behaviours, if acquired through a pro-violent socialisation process, may well be remediated by an anti-violence intervention delivered at a critical time in the development of the individual. Testing such a proposition was beyond the scope of this work, however, the model developed was underpinned by the notion that evidently there are strong mitigating factors at work in society and in particular in the world of young people which ensures that despite regular exposure to on-screen violence they most often choose socially acceptable behaviour.

The curriculum developed and the thrust of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention is premised on the belief that violent and bullying behaviours do not emanate from watching simulated violence on TV and in videos. It is proposed that violent and bullying behaviours are established and maintained through a deliberate socially educative process of tolerance and reinforcement in the real life experiences and contacts of violent individuals. This process does not exist in the experience of most young people irrespective of their violence-viewing. At most, Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder and Huesmann (1977) proposed that pro-violent individuals may select or prefer pro-violent media, but whether this informs violent and bullying processes is still to be substantiated.

**Discussion and Significance**

Within the context of this portfolio, challenging the perception that violence-viewing influences young people to engage in aggressive behaviour was an important consideration in terms of determining the nature and parameters of violence and bullying in schools. At best, unfortunately, the literature establishes a tenuous link with the violent behaviour of young people. It also provides no explanation at all for the fact that the overwhelming majority of young people who view violence show no propensity for emulation whatsoever. While violence-viewing contributes nothing
positive to the social and moral development of young people, it cannot be blamed for precipitating violent behaviours despite sometimes excessive viewing (Goldsmith, 1997; Young & Young, 1997). This is an important analysis to undertake since wasted time, efforts and resources attempting to determine the extent of the impact and relative power of various media genres diverts attention, focus and effort from more effective and strategically targeted programs.

Perhaps a more parsimonious approach is to examine the social and psychological buffers that seem to protect most young people from violent media images and assist in sustaining acceptable non-violent behaviours for the most part. The notion of modelling aggressive and violent behaviours can be traced back to Bandura (1973) in his observational experiments of young children exposed to simulated violence by an adult against a large doll. Participants subsequent emulation of the adults’ behaviour by hitting and pushing the doll was interpreted as evidence that children will copy “violent” behaviours they observe. Unfortunately, the inaccuracy of this observation has rarely been questioned and the mythology that children will become violent by watching a pretence of violence undertaken by adults became established. A more careful analysis of this experimental situation would establish that the adult engaged in simulated violence as did the children. Hence it cannot be extrapolated from observations of pretend violence that children would similarly copy real adult violence and indeed they rarely do (Heusmann & Bachrach, 1986). Had the adult in the experimental situation engaged in real violence (which was ethically impossible) towards a real child, it is highly doubtful that the children would have enjoyed observing such behaviour or been inclined to copy it if given the opportunity. Children who observe or are witnesses to domestic or socially violent adult behaviour (i.e., real violence towards real people) become and remain traumatised (Roberts, 1998), but do not necessarily engage in violence themselves. Spatz-Widom (1995) describes the emotional damage of early abusive experiences as manifested in “low self-esteem, depression, withdrawal and in the extreme, suicide” (p. 261). Simulated violence is not violence. Violent behaviour is behaviour selected by an individual in order to inflict damage, harm or injury on another person or property. The reality and intention of the act are critical to the definition. If there is no real harm, hurt or damage there has been no real violence. Violent simulations—unless enacted to be threatening or harmful—do not satisfy the definition.
The vast majority of young people in our society are effectively immunised against the impact of violence-viewing through the consistent influence of pro-social experiences and expectations. A small minority who are subject to inadequate parenting and pro-violent socialisation processes may develop a psychological or personal preference for violence. They are likely to select violent viewing to reinforce their world-view as well as for entertainment. Other research indicates that it is individuals who demonstrate a capacity or orientation towards violence who are likely to select violent viewing for the purpose of instruction. Lefkowitz, et al. (1977) were the first to suggest that boys who are violent at an early age will choose violent media to reinforce their deviant perceptions and behaviours. While these are the rare exceptions, they are nevertheless the young people most likely to present in need of individual intervention for engaging in violent or bullying behaviour at school. They are therefore an important group to identify within school systems, and to provide with appropriate remedial intervention programs as early as possible. However, it is nevertheless inaccurate to suggest that such media exposure is harmful or instructive for the greater population of viewers.

Further, the issue of “desensitisation” to violence is suggested as an outcome of exposure to media violence. While de-sensitisation to media violence may well result in young people seeking more and more graphic depictions of simulated violence, it has not been established that this leads to desensitisation in those enduring or witnessing real life violence. Rather, the great majority of young people are sympathetic, anxious and afraid when real and even simulated violence is observed (Buckingham, 1997; Cantor, 1997; Ramsden, 1997; Van der Voort & Beentjes, 1997). Moliter and Hirsch (1994) express concern that exposure to media violence desensitises children to real-life aggression and that children tend to tolerate more aggressive behaviour in others if they have first viewed violence on film. Levine (1994) proposes a similar argument that media exposure causes tolerance of aggression. There can be two explanations for these results: Either watching violence causes children to become passive and therefore tolerant or accepting of aggression, or, watching video violence is unlikely to cause children to react with aggression, neither of which interpretations supports the contention that violence viewing influences young people to engage in violence.
Failure to intervene or complain in circumstances where violence is witnessed does not indicate that violence is accepted. It is far more likely to indicate that the observer is without resources to act. Passivity is not the same as resiliency (eg. reporting) or resistance, both of which skills are appropriate responses to observed aggression. Ageback (1997), on the other hand, states that “evidence proving familiarisation with media violence leads to indifference towards violence in real life, is yet to be unveiled”. Given that millions of young people daily watch on-screen “violence” in a variety of forms such as cinema, videos and computer games without exhibiting violence (Griffiths, 1997; Young & Young 1997) it must be acknowledged that current socialisation processes are effective and powerful. Young people have usually already been exposed to well-established inhibiting social mores and values for a long period before they begin viewing media violence. It would seem these values provide the buffers necessary to assist them in differentiating what is promoted on screen as acceptable from what is actually acceptable to the people who are important to them. There can be no doubt that there has been a concerted effort in recent times to implicate violence-viewing with specific juvenile and other crimes such as the Bolger case in the UK (Petrie, 1994), the Port Arthur massacre, and mass murders in schools, however, such connections have not been generally verifiable.

Implications for the Present Investigation

This perspective on violence in young people is not popularly accepted, nevertheless it is incorporated in this body of work in an attempt to rein in the more florid assertions about the influence of the media on the behaviours of young people. The cognitive learning process is still the most credible explanation for the acquisition of violent behaviour. Exposure to media models does not provide the consistency or immediacy of familial or social contact and reinforcement (Valkenberg, 1998) to establish the behaviours. Violent media images are not socially productive or justifiable, and despite being widely sanctioned, hold no redeeming features in the education of young people. It is a reasonable contention, given the evidence of outcome for most viewers, that they nevertheless do not create violent individuals where none existed prior to exposure. Frequently, teachers, parents and others in the community propose that children and young people are violent when they engaged in simulated aggression which is developmentally
expected or emulate their on-screen heroes such as the “Ninja Turtles”, “Rambo” and “Rocky” irrespective of whether any real harm or hurt results. Therefore, in community and school training and in-service sessions presented as a component of this program of research, the influence of the media is discussed along with other relevant and more demonstrably powerful factors. To establish the level of responsibility of parents and teachers in remediating and instilling appropriate behaviours, it is important to reduce the reliance on media as a blameworthy instrument in the development of violent and bullying behaviours. The implication for this program of research is that the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention must address individual orientations and seek causal factors in the environmental and interpersonal milieu. Bullying in school is endemic and pervasive not as a result of media depictions of its social acceptability, but as a result of environmental structures which provide unmonitored access to victims and dominant interpersonal behaviours which are ignored or reinforced.

**Peer Abuse as a Child Protection Issue**

**Background**

During the research program undertaken with four high schools in NSW, analyses were undertaken of the responses of students to question four of the survey (see Appendix 2.1) which listed nine behaviours identified in the current literature as typical of bullying (Besag, 1994; Byrne, 1993; Olweus, 1993; Smith, 1994). The behaviours were similar to those mentioned in the child abuse literature as typical of the behaviours endured by children and young people during abuse by adults, (Alsaker & Valkanover, 2001; Besharov, 1998; Finkelhor & Hotaling, 1984; Kent & Waller, 1998). Key results of these analyses clearly indicate the range, intensity and impact of bullying behaviours on the population of each school. The latter included the finding that 17.2% of all students reported being bullied at least once each week, and that the most frequently reported types of bullying were verbal abuse, exclusion and physical abuse, including being hit or kicked (Healey, Dowson & Bowen, 2003, see Appendix 4.1.5). Interpretation of this data in conjunction with the child abuse literature exposed the close correlation between the two sets of experiences and the concept of applying the child protection legislation to the provision of protection to students in bullying or peer abusive situations emerged as a new perspective in the
bullying paradigm. Clearly, from the quantitative data, bullying or peer abuse was a relevant and, to date neglected, aspect of child abuse, according to current legislative definitions.

The conceptualisation of peer abuse as child abuse was first explored by the author in a paper presented at the British Association for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Conference in York, UK in 2000 (Healey, 2000, see Appendix 3.5) when indications for intervention were also discussed. The theory was further developed and presented as a legislative issue at the 2001 Australian and New Zealand Education and the Law Association Conference in Melbourne (Healey, 2001b, see Appendix 3.6). At this time, the concept was seen as pragmatic for future intervention. It provides a legally and professionally responsible avenue for intervention to support teachers in their efforts to protect individuals enduring bullying in school and offers an innovative protective intervention for the negative impact on children and young people. This perspective emerged as an outcome of professional responsibility and research of the author in relation to child protection issues in the field of teacher education as well as from the data analyses (see Chapter 2).

Discussion and Significance

Child protection has received a good deal of recent attention as a result of the recommendations of the Wood Royal Commission (1997), which implicated a number of school personnel for failure to follow mandated procedures for child protection. Further, a review of the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 under which teachers were mandated to report suspected or disclosed child sexual abuse led to the declaration of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act, NSW, 1998 which extended the legal obligations of mandatory notification to include all forms of child abuse. With the proclamation of this Act in December 2000, a thorough retraining of teachers in the processes of mandatory reporting was undertaken in the Department of Education, NSW, but despite the specific wording of the legislation that “all institutions responsible for the care and protection of children provide an environment for them that is free of violence and exploitation” (Act, NSW Government, 1998, Chapter 2, Article 8a and 8b), the issue of peer abuse has not been considered for inclusion in the legislation.
The Act also states that a child or young person is at risk of harm “if current concerns exist for the safety, welfare or well-being of the child or young person” (Act, NSW Government, 1998, Chapter 2) and “the child or young person’s physical or psychological needs are not being met or are at risk of not being met” (Act, NSW Government, 1998, chapter 3(23)). If these criteria are established and the employee has reasonable grounds to suspect that the child is at risk of harm, then a report must be made as soon as possible to ensure the protection and support of the child. In view of the research evidence uncovered in this investigation, it was not unreasonable to suggest that peer abuse should be incorporated under the auspices of the provisions for protection of children in the Act. In the case of peer abuse, teachers often have more extensive information, records of incidents and formal observations of the abusive behaviours of students towards their peers than would be possible to gather for other forms of abuse. Teachers are protected from litigation under the legislation should their allegations be unproven, but in all likelihood their reports would be substantiated given their first-hand knowledge and evidence of the abuse.

In the USA, legal mandates exist in all states with punitive sanctions including fines and imprisonment applicable for failure to notify (Kampulainen et al., 1998). In Hong Kong (Liau, Liu, Yu & Wong, 1999), Egypt (Youssef, Attila & Kamel, 1998), and the UK (Smith, 1999) there is an apparent reluctance to notify all forms of child abuse and peer abuse is not considered for notification under the auspices of child protection. Hence, under-reporting of all forms of abuse is an international phenomenon, notwithstanding mandatory procedures present in most western nations (King, Reece, Bendel & Patel, 1998; O’Toole, Webster, O’Toole & Lucal, 1999). Despite a fourfold increase in the rate of reporting child abuse between 1976 and 1995 (Zellman & Faller, 1996), this represents far fewer cases than researchers believe are notifiable (Finkelhor & Hotaling, 1984; Tilden et al., 1994). In other countries the issue of peer abuse has been addressed using a range of legislative interventions, most of which require an adversarial approach. In New Zealand, the liability of schools under a range of legislative provisions including accident compensation, personal injury law, health and safety regulations and breach of contract, have all been attempted and in some cases have led to successful prosecutions against schools and individuals (Hay-Mackenzie, 2001). In Canada, the
Young Offenders Act is often used to deal with cases of bullying (Anderson & Fraser, 2002). In Victoria, Australia, the amended Crimes (Family Violence) Act 1987 Stalking Provision (Section 21A(2)) has been implemented in over six hundred cases between children as a means of addressing the problem of victimisation (Coate, 2001). Generally, private litigation is sought when parents and individuals believe that they have been poorly served by the school in terms of protection, and often damages are awarded (see Appendix 3.5 for a specific case).

The term “abuse” is often used to describe the inappropriate, harmful and aggressive behaviours of young people towards their peers during the process of bullying (Dawkins, 1995; Morita, Soeda, Soeda & Taki, 1999; Smith, 1999). Nevertheless, common interpretations of the term abuse do not seem to be applied in the case of bullying. Abuse which is seen in society as an abhorrent, often criminal act when used in relation to child or spousal or aged person, abuse is often not seen this way when used in reference to peer abuse. Rarely are the former types of abuse seen as an accepted or inherent aspect of childhood or adolescence, marriage or old age. Bullying on the other hand is often described as just part of growing up and even as useful in the development of social maturity and competency.

The issue of abuse as adversity and as a valuable contributor to social development is thoroughly discussed in Appendix 3.8 (Healey, 2002b) in this portfolio in regard to resiliency. Fundamentally, it cannot be claimed that abuse represents an opportunity for psychological or personal growth, and this notion needs to be carefully addressed in intervention. In terms of the types of behaviours endured, their intensity, frequency and psychological impact, peer abuse can readily be shown to parallel child abuse as defined in the legislation and the literature (Ambert, 1995; Portwood, 1999; Roscoe, 1990; also see Appendices 3.5 and 3.6). The non-accidental nature of the injuries, the power relationships between the victim and perpetrator (though not as obvious between peers), the threats of harm and demands for secrecy that characterise peer victimisation equate to child abuse on all levels of analysis. Emotional abuse of children which impacts on their psychological functioning and well-being includes: “acts of rejection” (Rutter, 1993,629), ‘spurning, terrorising, isolating, exploitation and denial of emotional responsivity [sic]” (Hart & Brassard, 1991,67) and the repetitive, sustained nature of the abuse as a definitive feature (Kent
& Waller, 1998, 396). Bullying is similarly described as involving "repeated taunting" (Munthe, 1989, 34); "put downs, insults, laughing and gesturing in derogatory ways" (Ambert, 1995, 179); social exclusion and demeaning (Roland, 1989, 29)—all of which are behaviours that would be acknowledged as abusive if conducted by an adult against a child. Hodges and Perry (1996) confirm that peer abuse has the effect of causing depression, low self-esteem and avoidance of school. Olweus (1993) also found elevated levels of depressive tendencies and poor self esteem in bullied individuals, which continued into young adulthood. Physical peer abuse can lead to suicide (Morita et al., 1999; Tatum, 1993) and hospitalisation or permanent damage at its worst (Healey, 2000) and the development of fear, anxiety or withdrawal in victims.

Ambert (1995) suggests that peer abuse is seen to differ from other forms of abuse on three key factors: the age of the perpetrator, formal power distinctions and neglect, which she believes are the factors which are generally used to diminish the impact of the behaviour. Since the abuse is undertaken by minors, the abuse is therefore minor; since there is no recognised power differential there can be no abusive relationship and peers are not responsible for their age mates so therefore neglect cannot be attributed to them. Barnett, Manly and Cicchetti (1993) delineate six dimensions on which child abuse can be identified and analysed comprising type of abuse, severity, frequency, developmental stage interventions and perpetrators. Peer abuse can be measured and analysed on each of these dimensions providing a comprehensive picture of its similar actiology to other forms of child abuse. Peer abuse corresponds with child abuse across types, severity and impact as the research discussed demonstrates.
Implications for the Present Investigation

Rarely in the current literature is the concept of peer abuse as a child protection issue explored and few researchers have addressed this issue (see Ambert, 1995 and Portwood, 1999). There is little research or evidence that peer abuse is recognised as a form of child abuse or that current child protection legal provisions are used in this way to protect children from bullying. This perspective has not been acknowledged in the recent literature and few references exist to support the proposal that the legislation devised in Australia and most other Western nations to protect children from abuse is also highly applicable in the case of peer abuse. Sheerin (1998) discusses the possibility of using the Irish Child Care Act to address the remedial needs of adolescent peer sexual abusers, but generally it is rare to find this approach suggested or initiated. Nevertheless, in terms of finding a non-adversarial, educative or remedial intervention to the issue of peer abuse, incorporating peer abuse as a component of legislation that addresses other forms of child abuse, seems to offer a pragmatic solution. In terms of this investigation, new data have been provided to illustrate clear links between the two and to support the proposal that child protection legislation be utilised to protect children from abuse and teachers and schools from litigation. This records for the first time a feasible, non-adversarial solution to legislative intervention without the necessity for new and specifically anti-bullying laws. These arguments are developed further in the appended papers (see Appendix 3.5 and 3.6), which thoroughly explore the implications for stakeholders and violators if the matter of peer abuse is formally incorporated into the child protection network.

Sheene (1998) suggests that the protection of children has been historically established as a government function. However, it is argued in this thesis, since more children are at risk from their peers than from abusive adults (Rigby & Slee, 1993b), protection should now be extended to include peer abuse as a child protection issue under the new legislation in NSW and future revisions elsewhere.
Resiliency as a Critical Factor in Resisting Bullying

Background

The popular contention that bullying will “toughen individuals up” for the real world is, in fact, a corruption of the perfectly acceptable notion that young people need to develop self-protective attitudes and behaviours in order to cope with life’s disappointments and challenges. Broadly speaking, resilience represents the latter notion—the development of the capacity to “bounce back” from adverse experiences, retain psychological equilibrium, continue to perform in a competent manner and generally give little overt indication of the impact of an adverse event. Researchers have defined resiliency in such operational terms, distinguishing responses to stress or abuse in terms of observable and measurable competent behaviours. A pedagogical model for simulating the acquisition of the attribute of resiliency, previously considered developmental, developed in light of data collected in this research program which revealed variations in student capacity to respond effectively to bullying. Cultural and gender differences in the interpretation of, and tolerance for peer abusive behaviours were also revealed (Healey, 2002a, see Appendix 3.7). In undertaking qualitative analyses of the data contained in the written and selected responses of the student respondents in the survey, these differences were made apparent.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the School Safety Survey seeks to establish the types levels, intensity and impact of bullying through a series of questions on the survey form. Specifically, question four requires students to record the behaviours they have endured on a weekly, or more frequent basis, to establish their status as victims of bullying. They are also asked to state how they would describe bullying and harassment at the school along a continuum from “not a problem” to “a major problem” in question 5 and in question 7, and record whether the school makes students feel good about themselves on a four point scale from “all feel good” to “few feel good”. Additionally they were asked whether they would be prepared to help others they saw being bullied. Resiliency is inferred from the responses to these questions. If the student is bullied, sometimes extensively, but nevertheless states that bullying is not a great problem, it is reasonable to assume they have
psychological resources including resiliency, which help them to overcome or cope with the experience. Students who are bullied less intensively, but who see bullying as a major problem, may well lack resiliency and find even minor episodes difficult to accept and recover from (Healey, 2002a, see Appendix 3.7). Resiliency was therefore interpreted as a critical skill for resisting bullying, and one which may be taught to victimised individuals.

Flow theory has been discussed as a model for enhancing student resilience (Parr, Montgomery & De Bell, 1998) through a process of alerting them to their individual interpretations of life experiences. The theory has been applied by the original theorist, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) to a wide range of risk-oriented activities as a means of analysing growth through challenge. Parr et al. suggest that the capacity for resilience may develop in the same way that solitary ordeals contribute to personal growth in that the individual takes a pro-active perspective which sees challenge in hardship and meets hardship by formulating goals for recovery. The capacity to formulate goals for action within the challenging environment and the belief that the self has the interpersonal resources to overcome the challenge results in “flow” or an ordering of consciousness towards a positive outcome. In a matrix they formulate consisting of the key elements of challenge and skill at high and low levels, psychological flow, “depends on achieving the right balance between how challenging one’s goals are and how effective one’s skills are in meeting those challenges” (Parr et al., p. 28). High-challenge coupled with high-skill is hypothesised to result in “flow” or a positive outcome, while high-challenge with low-kill will result in anxiety. The theory is relevant to this discussion of resiliency in relation to bullying as it acknowledges the need for skills development or acquisition in the areas of self-talk, self-belief and goal-setting in order to successfully meet challenges, and this capacity can certainly be trained or taught, for example, in cognitive restructuring approaches.

**Discussion and Significance**

Resiliency is variously described as a predisposition towards positive expectations and outcomes despite adverse experiences and as the development of the capacity to overcome adversity despite natural predispositions to stress responses. Irrespective of the source, whether innate or acquired, the competency that resiliency
represents is a critical factor in resisting bullying. Resilient behaviours seem to indicate that the victim of abuse is able to overcome the adverse conditions and experiences encountered and continue to function as an adaptive individual. Various factors have been identified as correlated with, or some argue pre-requisite, to the ability to recover from adversity, including positive self-regard (Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990), academic success, positive social and emotional adjustment and adaptive social skills (Kinard, 1998).

In the context of bullying intervention and resistance it may be necessary to ensure these competencies are developed and thereby equip the victim of bullying with psychological strengths with which to respond in an assertive and effective manner. Nevertheless, it should also be noted that the capacity to defend their own interests should not preclude victims from protective intervention. Nor does it negate the stressful impact of the bullying behaviour. The competency of the victim in seeking assistance should not in any way reduce the level of responsibility of the bully. Victims of bullying or peer abuse do not form an homogeneous group and their capacities to resist the bully differ along a continuum from passivity and surrender to resilience and recovery, as can be seen in a model presented by the author at the National Protective Behaviours Conference in 2002 (Healey, 2002a). Resilience may be seen as an attribute which is measurable and quantitative and therefore clearly identifiable as a personality and behavioural trait in particular individuals (Blankenship, 1998; Freitas & Downey, 1998; Gardano, 1998; Rutter, 1993). It can therefore be taught, in all likelihood.

There is some discussion in the literature of the notion of protective factors residing within individuals who respond in a more resilient fashion to abusive situations and these include intellect (Carver, 1998), perceived social support (Byrne, 1993), and effective social skills (Doll & Lyon, 1998). Nevertheless, we can assume that the abusive behaviour is just as damaging to these individuals, but that they have developed overt responses which offer psychological buffers rather than passive responses which expose them to further incidents of abuse. This perspective is relevant to intervention in that the emotional responses of the victim must be a paramount consideration and be fully understood and accepted if the victim is to be successful in establishing more effective and assertive responses. Individuals who
exhibit resiliency in response to bullying cannot be considered less harmed than individuals who exhibit less effective responses. Kinard (1998) points out that the factors that define resilience are sometimes also reported as capacities which lead to the development of resilience. Therefore, if ineffective victims can be taught to exhibit more resilient behaviours such as help-seeking, avoidance of the bully, and accessing Peer Advocacy, their experience of bullying may have a reduced effect.

Having good self-regard, for example, may indicate resilience is present or it may facilitate the establishment of resilient behaviour where none was previously demonstrated, perhaps due to the absence of adversity. This becomes a critical matter in the discussion of responses to, and the impact of bullying. While some children may experience chronic life stressors such as poverty, maltreatment and school failure, others may be exposed to relatively short-term adversity such as bullying. The literature with regard to resilience more often refers to the circumstance whereby long-term adversity leads to the development of resilience. A plethora of research and discussion on the subject is devoted mainly to the characteristics and indicators of resilience and to consideration of the source of such competence given the negative outcomes of abuse which are generally consequent for the child (Carver, 1998; Wilson & Gottman, 1996). Consideration was also given to the effects of abuse on both resilient and non-resilient individuals in this work to determine whether resilience provides protection from distress and the capacity to resist or avoid bullying (Healey, 2002b, see Appendix 3.8). Cowan, Cowan and Shulz (1996) consider risk and resilience in families, exploring the concept of multiple vulnerabilities and risks which compound the impact of adversity on susceptible individuals. They discuss protection and buffering mechanisms within families as means of developing resilience. In this context, resilience unfolds over time as the individual practices resistant behaviours which are met with positive responses in their environment which in turn leads to the development of competence through resiliency. As an example, the child who expresses discomfort at the teasing or physical interactions of a sibling or parent, and whose protestations lead to the cessation of the behaviour without rejection, will move along a pathway towards legitimate resistant behaviour and resiliency. The authors further indicate that psychological distress is minimised through the process, and view the interactions as preventative.
With regard to the bullying paradigm, it becomes clear that without protective and buffering mechanisms within the victim’s environment, be it school or home, resilient behaviours alone cannot protect the individual. The way in which bullying behaviours are perceived and acknowledged, however, determines the degree of persistence and ultimate effectiveness of victims. In an unprotected and unreceptive environment where efforts to resist bullying through, for example reporting or escape, are thwarted, ignored or even punished, resilience will not develop and the stress may well be multiplied. Dubrow, Roecker and D’Imperio (1997) explore risk and protective mechanisms which contribute to adjustment and resilience in children and adolescents, with an emphasis on interventions which promote competence in young people. These theorists believe that resilience can be developed through the acquisition of resilient behaviours offered in an appropriate intervention. Finally, in examining substance use in young people, Wills, Blechman and McNamara (1996) offer further support for a competency-based model for the development of resilience. In their discussion of the impact of family or other social supports and the contribution of these to coping and competence in young people, they use the perspective of a developmental continuum of resilience reinforced by supportive family and social environments.

The possibility of teaching resiliency skills to individuals who do not demonstrate a natural psychological capacity to recover from abuse is proposed. The notion that resistance to bullying is not simply an intra- or interpersonal skill, but that it resides within a social milieu that may well support the abuser is also given credence through the research data. Resiliency as a set of social skills rather than an innate capacity evolving from psychological character traits is an attractive theory since it proposes a pragmatic origin. Resiliency can be developed and taught if there is enough evidence it comprises specific skills, behaviours and attitudes. Several researchers take this view and examine social problem-solving skills in relation to levels of adjustment and resiliency. Luthar (1997) and other researchers, however, discuss a multi-dimensional model of resiliency whereby stress levels are not necessarily reduced by the demonstration of skills. Resiliency comprises interpersonal, developmental and psychological capacities as well as socially acquired skills and young people may remain competent in some areas such as academic achievement, maintenance of social status through sports and so forth, yet
nonetheless be experiencing high levels of stress and anxiety in response to adversity. This theoretical perspective supports the view that overt compensatory behaviours which appear to be effective may well mask underlying severe stress reactions to bullying or other adverse situations and cannot be viewed as evidence that resilience inoculates individuals from stress. Nevertheless, the acquisition and application of resilient behaviours can result in demonstrable resiliency despite internal stress. The purpose of developing resistant behaviours is not to deny the impact of the bullying behaviour, but to provide an interim response which may divert the bully and thereby give some relief from stress temporarily. Victims need to behave as though they are resilient in order to secure relief from the victimisation.

**Implications for Present Investigation**

Resilience is not often discussed in relation to bullying intervention, and certainly the proposition that resiliency skills can be imparted to bullied individuals has not been suggested in the literature. This supports the contention that viewing resiliency as a teachable response to bullying is an innovative solution to the problem. If the behaviours which indicate that resilience is present can be identified, as indeed they are in the literature, then those behaviours are almost certainly able to be described in measurable and observable terms which will facilitate acquisition. Such skills as persistent help-seeking, accurate reporting of the experiences, continued attendance at school with support and protection, maintenance of regular activities in the face of the abuse can be monitored and encouraged, given a supportive environment in which teachers and peers have been trained to intervene in a positive manner. The Peer Advocacy program described in this portfolio incorporates, in the training phase, several sessions related to resiliency (Healey, in press-b, Appendix 4.5.3).

A distinction is made in the papers appended between resilience and resiliency (Healey, 2002c, see Appendix 3.8), namely that resilience is the state of being resilient or having an attribute called resilience, while resiliency can be defined as the demonstrable behaviours by which resilience can be identified in the individual. This distinction merely enables qualitative descriptions of behaviours which can be clearly stated to be evident or missing, and which can then be taught. The persistent help-seeking behaviour of resilient individuals, for example may be
taught, reinforced and practised in a supportive program until the victim of bullying adopts the behaviour as part of their response repertoire. This approach is, of course, reliant on the responsiveness of those from whom help is sought, which is why it needs to be embedded within a comprehensive intervention. Teaching the skills of resiliency is incorporated into the fifth component of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention which addresses curricular intervention.

**Peer Advocacy as a Functional Response to Peer Abuse**

**Background**

This perspective emerged as an outcome of data analysis of student responses to the survey whereby the attitudes, beliefs, prejudices and opinions of the population of the survey, across cultural, age, gender and bullied status were examined (refer to data discussed in chapter 2; Healey, Dowson & Bowen, 2003; Appendix 4.1.5, Healey (in press), Appendix 3.9 and 3.10). This revealed corroborative evidence of current literature with regard to the social status of bullies, the unwillingness of peers to act on behalf of those they saw victimised, the lack of empathy for bullied individuals and student ambivalence about the capacity of teachers to intervene effectively to assist. Peer Advocacy forms the basis of an anti-bullying program design (Healey in press-a, see Appendix 4.5.4), as it became apparent that a greater emphasis on the process of advocacy was required for effective intervention. A theoretical construct for the process has been articulated in the appended paper (Healey, in press-b, see Appendix 3.9 and 4.5.4) as well as a description of the program as a proposed pragmatic application in school settings.

Peer Advocacy is a program of skills development which is placed in the curricula component (component five) of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention (see Chapter 4). Peer Advocacy is an anti-bullying program which comprises a series of training sessions addressing key interpersonal and interaction skills such as introspection, empathy, help-seeking and reporting, resiliency and advocacy. The Peer Advocacy phase involves a ten-step procedure for representative advocacy undertaken by students who successfully complete the training and who volunteer to advocate for peers who are victims of bullying.
This involves commitment to the seven guiding principles and seven operational principles of Peer Advocacy. It is anticipated that the process can be adopted in schools as a functional and collaborative approach to intervention in bullying.

Advocacy has also been accepted in the literature as an established and effective means of providing qualified support for needy individuals in the quest for improved services otherwise denied them as a consequence of their personal incapacities or lack of skills (Ward & Page-Hanify, 1986). Advocacy is proposed in a range of circumstances including advocacy for children who are abused, neglected or exhibiting mental health difficulties or disabilities (Balcazar, 1996; Knitzer, 1996; Paull, 1998; Watkins & Callicut, 1997). It is described as a process whereby a skilled individual acts on behalf of a person with disadvantage to ensure their rights and welfare are protected (Stroeve, 1998). The impact of the process of advocacy is discussed in terms of positive outcomes for individuals including satisfaction through participation (Ward et al., 1986), but also as resulting at times in stress reactions. (Doueck, Weston, Filbert, Beekhuis & Redlich, 1997; Goodley, 1997). There is a strong tradition of advocacy practice in the field of special education and disability services which provides a substantial framework and foundation for the introduction of Peer Advocacy as a bullying intervention in schools. The specific application of Peer Advocacy to bullying intervention also evolved as a result of research which indicates that victims of bullying will seek the help of peers (Rigby & Slee, 1993).

The program of research described here also found that victims hold unfavourable views of the capacity and willingness of teachers to assist them when complaints about bullying are made (Healey, et al., 2003). The elevated social status of bullies and the fact that peers were in general unsympathetic towards victims was also revealed in the research data (see Chapter 2). From these research results, and an examination of a broad range of literature relevant to the issues (Healey, in press-b, see Appendix 3.9), the concept and processes of Peer Advocacy developed and the social imperative of using this specific strategy to address peer abuse unfolded. The critical factor in peer abuse or bullying is obviously peer attitudes and behaviours, and the most potent intervention is therefore, of necessity peer-focused.

Peer Advocacy is a functional new response which may be taught to peers of victims as an intervention in bullying. It is a helping strategy which provides victims
of bullying with an individual mentor to assist them in their efforts to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy is an innovative adaptation of the advocacy process which has more often been employed to support individuals with disability and other community members who seek justice through the aid of knowledgeable and capable others. It is also a new approach to intervention in bullying as it recognises that without the acceptance and assistance of peers for the problems faced by victims of bullying, very little will change in the current social responses to bullying and victimisation. The Peer Support Foundation provides training for older students, with teacher assistance, to teach younger peers about bullying, and a comprehensive package has been developed to deliver this information (Rigby, 2003). However the intervention described here as Peer Advocacy takes responsibility much further and considers circumstances where there is an absence of support within the school or local environment where the bullying occurs. It prepares young people to develop mature protective attitudes and a level of independent resourcefulness to draw upon when the environment is neglectful or even hostile. Hence, the intervention developed requires a more formal, documented and structured approach than traditional informal interactive approaches (Maines and Robinson, 1992; Pikas, 1989) which depend upon the good will of all protagonists for resolution and which caste bullies in a less unfavourable light then more punitive approaches, (Olweus, 1999; Tattum and Herbert, 1993).

The structure and processes of Peer Advocacy as articulated above and described in Appendix 4.5.4 (Healey, in press-a) are based on specific operational and philosophical principles related to bullying intervention. Peer Advocacy proposes the inclusion of peers in a systematic process which demands a morally and legally conscientious response from those in authority. It necessitates the induction of young people into a training program to develop the attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation and empathy to speak out and secure assistance for individuals who are being hurt through bullying. Peer Advocacy draws on the successful tradition of having others act on behalf of those in need and applies similar principles and practices to the training of young people to take responsibility for assisting peers who are victims of bullying.
Discussion and Significance

Peer Advocacy is grounded in a range of theoretical constructs including those related to the psychology of victimization and resilience, and the concept of social capital. It also draws upon advocacy and child protection issues and practices including programs for skills development. While advocacy as a practice has generally involved a partnership between an individual whose needs are not being met because of their inability to advocate for themselves and another individual who has relatively superior power, status, knowledge, ability or skills, Peer Advocacy represents a relationship between individuals of like status. Both the Peer Advocate and the victim of bullying are young people whose social status, power, knowledge and capacities are obviously inferior to those from whom they must seek assistance.

In advocacy programs which support individuals with limitations of intellectual, physical or psychological capacities it is essential to select an advocate who can act on their behalf in circumstances where they may otherwise be denied their rights and due processes (Smith & Anton, 1997). Such advocates undertake to obtain justice and services for their partner in situations where particular organisational or procedural intricacies may require the intervention of someone with the necessary skill or knowledge to achieve access to the requisite service (Alper & Schloss, 1996). Similarly, in the case of Peer Advocates, a young person is trained to understand, navigate or instigate the procedures necessary for the victim of bullying to receive a fair hearing from the adults, in particular teachers, with the authority to intervene within the school, family and social system.

Peer Advocacy is a specific anti-bullying intervention presented within a supportive school community milieu in which appeals to those in authority for intervention should be successful. Peer Advocates are expected to put the case for and with their partners to adults whose receptivity and responses must reinforce the practice. To this end, Peer Advocate mentoring is included as a component of the education in-service offered as part of the Macarthur Model, and is discussed in more detail in the following chapter. Nevertheless, provision is made for help-seeking skills to be utilised when the school or local authority is not receptive to complaints and requests for intervention. Indeed, as a protective intervention it is unique in preparing young people for the circumstance of not being believed or supported
when reporting abuse. This skill has wide-ranging applications beyond bullying since the child protection literature indicates that the unsupported abused individual suffers greatly from the lack of support they receive for their reports (Finkelhor, et al., 1994).

Over the past decade the use of depersonalising descriptors such as “human resources” and the tendency to consider social issues in terms of economic rationalism rather than interpersonal investment, has resulted in a shift towards functional rather than personal social support and an “ideology of exclusion” (Rees, 1994,173). The pursuit of individualism and self-interest—the “greed is good” phenomenon—which operates at the expense of a broader commitment to social values and relationships can be seen as contributing to a less responsive and less supportive community (Dalton, Draper & Weeks, 1996). This emphasis on economic capital does not acknowledge the value of social capital as a true indicator of the prosperity of a community, but it must be stated that without a recognition of the cost to the community of a failure to support and assist those being bullied substantial fiscal and social costs will ensue. During childhood and often into adulthood, individuals who have been severely victimised by bullies require additional social, medical and legal resources which could be avoided if early intervention was offered. As with untreated health and ecological deficits, the postponement of intervention leads to gradually increasing service requirements for recovery or remediation. Additionally, the continuation of the bullying behaviour in a climate which endorses it inevitably leads to further costs as bullies relocate eventually to adult vocations as managers and executives reinforced for their capacity to disregard the human and focus on the fiscal investment in their organization. It is the perceived lack of investment of interpersonal and other necessary resources which eventually contributes to incapacitating the victim and reducing trust. Peer Advocacy contributes to social capital and therefore to the well-being of the broader community by encouraging young people to provide each other with assistance, therefore preventing the additional costs which result from the abandonment of victims of bullying.

Peers have a supportive role in securing the assistance of the wider community and relevant adults in intervening to protect young people from bullying.
The importance of establishing a more formal supportive role for peers in securing the assistance of the wider community and relevant adults in intervening to protect young people from bullying is an innovative and critical contribution to bullying intervention. Cowie, Smith, Boulton and Laver (1994) describe the process of peer mentoring involving older students using their skills and maturity to give support to younger students. Sullivan, Cleary and Sullivan (2003) outline a peer mentoring program and detail the procedure within a school. This approach is documented as successful, requires less long-term training than the Peer Advocacy program and may be an appealing alternative. They outline a full day training workshop incorporating mentoring skills. However, it is proposed that the longer period of involvement required for Peer Advocacy training may be preferable and necessary. Long, Fabricius, Muscheno and Palumbo (1998) discuss the capacity of young people to mediate on behalf of peers and indicate that the level of maturity of the trainee is a critical element in the success of such programs.

Peer Advocates emerge as an outcome of the prolonged training and their commitment is voluntary following successful completion of the program. There is obviously a need for a range of interventions which recruit peers to advocate on behalf of less-capable others, given the research evidence. The potential for victimization often results from the social isolation of the target individual in the bullying paradigm and this disconnectedness from a supportive community in turn enables the bully to continue, since social isolation facilitates the abuse of young people (Garbarino & Kostelny, 1992; Tomison & Tucci, 1997). Establishing and maintaining supportive social networks can, on the other hand, equip young people with the resources to seek and access the help they need to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy focuses on increasing the investment of young people in each others’ welfare when supportive adults are not available or not concerned to intervene in what are often regarded as childish “disputes”. It is only with great difficulty that young people are able to convince those with the authority to intervene that their help is necessary to protect a young person from harm. A more comprehensive discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of Peer Advocacy is undertaken in Appendix 3.9 and an explanation of the process is in Appendix 4.5.4.
Implications for the Present Investigation

Having established the potential for protective intervention by Peer Advocates for those who endure bullying in schools, the major focus for consideration for future research is to thoroughly implement the strategy and evaluate efficacy. Current social attitudes and responses to bullying correlate closely with those evident in child abuse generally, including the tendency to discount the incidence and impact of the activity, to maintain the social status and privileges of the perpetrator and to minimize the responsibility and capacity of others to intervene (Finkelhor et al., 1994). Peer Advocacy empowers young people to work together to secure protection and the sanctioning of the activities of abusive peers to which they are vulnerable and exposed.

Peer Advocacy also prepares young people by educating them about their rights to protection under the law as well as the provisions of anti-discrimination, harassment and assault legislation. In the absence of proactive and responsible authorities, Peer Advocacy empowers young people to act on their own or others’ behalf to ensure that their rights and safety are maintained. It is imperative therefore that the strategy be refined and implemented with mature school children whose educational environment is documented as exposing them and others to bullying. If implemented in supportive environments, the impact of the process and the positive outcomes anticipated can, over time, create the expectation that young people can assume the power for their own protection if no other assistance is forthcoming. The processes for Peer Advocacy outlined above were constructed from an awareness of negotiation theory, advocacy and bargaining strategies employed to successful effect, in particular, in the field of industrial relations. The structure of the training process permits a stratified approach which begins as negotiation and bargaining, but strengthens in the event of an unreasonable or unproductive response. Hence this perspective was informed by previous research, the current programme and previous practice in other fields and is important for informing intervention in regard to assisting victims of bullying.
Summary

In this chapter the emergence of theoretical perspectives grounded in previous research were discussed. The perspectives were presented in their final format at the Australian and New Zealand Associations for Research in Education International Conference in Auckland, in November 2003. (Healey, 2003 see Appendix 3.11). These perspectives offer fresh insights into the origins and components of violence and bullying in schools, and serve to underpin the development of a comprehensive intervention customised for the specific setting which is discussed in detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4
The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Violence and Bullying in Schools

Introduction

This chapter presents a thorough description and discussion of the evolution, components and applications of the model devised originally to address violence in schools then adapted for bullying intervention. The Macarthur Model is a comprehensive intervention devised to address all key aspects of intervention (see Chapter 1 for a diagrammatic overview). It is called the Macarthur Model because it originated as a research focus for the author at the Macarthur Institute of Higher Education, and has been refined, adapted, expanded and applied extensively over a substantial period.

Discussed in this chapter is an overview of research products (publications, manuals for training and staff development, records of work with schools and community organisations) to address the issues of violence and bullying in order to illustrate the comprehensiveness and scope of the portfolio and the Macarthur Model. Evidence is presented of the efficacy of the model in raising the awareness and knowledge levels of participants through the intervention, in establishing school practices and procedures which address violence in the early stages of the program, and addressing school bullying in particular.

Background

Violence and bullying behaviours are evident in a range of social institutions and result in substantial fiscal and human costs in the workplace, in schools and in society as a whole (McCarthy, et al., 1996). Fundamentally, it can be established that although many social institutions and organisations currently attempt to address the problems of violence and bullying in society through a range of approaches and interventions, it is the comprehensiveness of the approach which will determine long-term positive outcomes. Each of the proposed components of the Macarthur Model must be addressed in order for the problems to be effectively managed.
Schools have a pivotal role in addressing issues of bullying and violence through a comprehensive intervention which provides access to knowledge, skills and feedback to assist students and schools to recognise, resist and respond appropriately.

Over recent years health, judicial and community institutions and organisations have independently attempted to address issues of violence and bullying through a range of policy, training, curricular and individual intervention mechanisms. Few have attempted to determine the parameters of violence and bullying in their sector prior to the implementation of crisis or conflict resolution, punitive, or other responsive interventions, or to establish the efficacy of such responses when delivered in isolation. However, in countries throughout Europe a concerted effort to address the issue of bullying as a major social problem has resulted in the initiation of government policy and legislation. Further, public education programs have been offered and school policy development given a priority as a means of addressing the serious and sustained negative outcomes of peer abuse and violence within school settings. The result has been a raised public awareness and considerable reduction in serious incidents of bullying across the European Economic Community (Smith et al., 1999). A public health model for violence intervention has been proposed (Prothrow-Stith, 1987) whereby programs for violence intervention and prevention are modelled on similar programs designed to reduce smoking, heart disease and drug taking. In the context of health education, changes to attitudes and behaviour have been successfully achieved through wide ranging publicly funded and broadly distributed education programs supported by health services specific to the requirements of those who are victims of the disease. Similarly, there can be no doubt that violence and bullying in society are health issues, and it is not unreasonable to propose a proportion of the health budget be allocated to train personnel in specific health related organisations for such interventions. To date little support of this type has been offered in terms of monetary resources for intervention, despite several notable investigations of the extent of the problem in Australia. The New South Wales Government Inquiry into Youth Violence (1995) and Australian Commonwealth Government Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training Inquiry into Violence in Schools (1994) inquiries into youth and school violence and the most recent Attorney
General's Department meta-evaluation of intervention programs (Rigby, 2003) quantify the problem and establish the need for further resourcing.

Local government initiatives to manage disruptive and violent behaviours within the community are becoming more common and focus on such issues as monitoring licensed premises, conducting safety audits and installing video surveillance in problematic areas (Fisher, 1995). Poor management of violent crowds such as at football matches and concerts have in the past resulted in deaths sometimes on a massive scale as in the UK (Mellor, 1995), and efforts have been made to install regulations and services to prevent further tragic outcomes. A coalition of county-supported organisations involved in responding to violence developed the Policy, Action, Collaboration, Training (PACT) approach (Cohen, 1993). This coalition pooled their collective expertise and resources to collaborate on program development across child and marital abuse organisations, police interventions and educational approaches. Such attempts at restructuring communities to manage violence utilising the resources available in more productive and creative ways reflects an awareness of the possibility of the effectiveness of this approach to intervention.

The judicial system has attempted in recent years to address issues of violence in society by introducing more individual responses to incidents, for example, through the "re-integrative shaming" process (Braithwaite & Daly, 1995). This is in an attempt to re-educate perpetrators and establish possibilities for rehabilitation outside the corrective services. There has been mixed success, not least because many offenders are not capable of feeling shame, empathy and guilt as a response to their misdemeanours (Morris & Maxwell 1993), but the focus on individual intervention is recommended. Systematic attention needs to be paid to those students who do not demonstrate a natural propensity for social competence and to broadening the repertoire of protective behaviours young people have to draw on in difficult situations. These important dimensions of relationship cannot be left to chance. Further, it is clear that the many influences on young people to accept violence, to endorse its use and to vicariously enjoy its portrayal need to be challenged. Rather, society needs to equip young people with factual information and opportunities to examine and discuss commonly held beliefs and attitudes about the
role and impact of violence in society. Education programs which focus specifically on violence and bullying intervention need to be carefully developed and presented to enable the acquisition of legitimate beliefs, behaviours and attitudes which reject violence, teach specific protective responses and permit a more positive prognosis for social competence. Clearly, an intervention devised to bring this information to the conscious attention of young people is needed and the most potent environment for delivery has been shown to be an educational setting (Goldstein & Conoly, 1997). These fundamental principles were the foundation for the development of the key components of the comprehensive approach described in this document.

Violence and bullying can be resolved through broadly applied education programs, curricula, remedial and therapeutic structures in the community and in schools; but schools must establish firm parameters of responsibility and embed these in corporate policy. The Macarthur Model attempts to address the latter and the evolution of this model is described in the next section of this chapter.

Evolution of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Violence and Bullying in Schools

The Macarthur Model evolved over a prolonged period of time while the author was engaged in school and government organisation initiatives to intervene in violence and bullying. Many of these activities and initiatives are presented in the portfolio and described briefly in this chapter. This work and a close examination of the current literature throughout the period of investigation resulted in the revelation of six key components for effective intervention. The model can be effectively applied in addressing violence or bullying within the school context, but has been most often used for intervention in bullying in this program of research.

In 1994, a paper titled “Coping with Violence in Schools” was presented at the Families and Violence Conference and later published in the proceedings (Jenkin, 1994b, see Appendix 4a). This paper includes publication of a prototype of the Macarthur Model, addressing four of the six components. It was also revised for publication in the School Safety Journal, (Jenkin, 1994a, see Appendix 3.1) in the same year, as the issue became more socially imperative. The complete model was
presented at the combined Australian and New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference in Auckland in 2003 (Healey, 2003b, see Appendix 4b). These papers illustrate the development of the model over a ten-year period.

Sullivan, Cleary and Sullivan (2003) outline six stages in the implementation of a whole school approach to bullying based on the original work of Olweus and Smith in Europe. The Macarthur Model capitalises upon and addresses all of the elements advocated by these authors, in a structured and comprehensive intervention initiated at the school level. While many other interventions adopt some of the components, none to date seems to apply them all consistently and progressively over a long enough period of time to be effective in either reducing the problems substantially or developing the attitudes and behaviours necessary to overcome the impact of bullying or violence in schools.

The six key components of the Macarthur Model are:

- **Component 1**: Determining the nature and parameters of violence or bullying in the school.
- **Component 2**: Education and training of school personnel, parents and community regarding violence or bullying.
- **Component 3**: Policy development related to violence or bullying in the school.
- **Component 4**: Organizational restructuring to facilitate management of violence or bullying in the school.
- **Component 5**: Curriculum for all students regarding violence and bullying.
- **Component 6**: Individual interventions for students involved in violence or bullying in the school.

Efficacy is dependent on all six components being addressed in a structured and comprehensive intervention over time within a selected milieu. It is anticipated that the components would be equally effective delivered together within non-education settings including workplaces and social organisations where proximity of personnel provides the milieu for abusive interactions. Having examined a wide range of such
interventions both internationally and within Australia, it has emerged that the six key components presented here and addressed throughout the portfolio are pivotal to successful intervention.

An approach described as Policy, Education, Action, Coping, and Evaluation (PEACE) (Slee, 1996a; 1996b) initiated in Australia incorporates several of the key components in an educational application to encourage non-aggressive interactions. Smith (1999) reports on the Sheffield project in the UK which addressed “whole-school policy, curriculum work, work in playgrounds and work with individual pupils and small groups involved in bullying situations” (p. 68). The Sheffield co-operative learning project (Cowie, Smith, Boulton & Laver 1994) utilised a co-operative group-work methodology to create positive changes and provided teacher in-servicing. McCarthy (1996) describes the impact of “bullying managerial behaviours” (p. 47) in the workplace and proposes that “identification, education, intervention and skilling” (p. 49) could address the problem. Rigby (2003), in his definitive meta-evaluation of bullying interventions found that “the commitment of a school to a program and strong involvement by staff in its implementation appears to be an important and possibly crucial factor in reducing bullying” (p. 3). He reports on a range of international interventions, each of which comprises a number of components, and which have been implemented with mixed effectiveness.

In some instances of intervention, increases in bullying behaviour have been reported as an outcome. For example, the Toronto Study implemented by Pepler et al. (1993) was devised to operate at four levels: the community, whole-school, each classroom and individual students. A peer conflict mediation program was introduced as well as increased supervision by teachers and some curricular intervention. Nevertheless, the results were seen as disappointing with more children reporting bullying after the intervention. This phenomenon is reported in a number of studies and possibly reflects increased reporting as an outcome of increased awareness, rather than increased instances of bullying. It also needs to be noted that conflict mediation seems an inappropriate methodology for use in bullying intervention since bullying is not reciprocal conflict and the participants are not equivalently culpable as is the case in fighting or conflict situations (see Appendix 3.9, Healey, in press-b, for discussion of this issue). Bullying is about abuse, not
conflict and this is an important distinction for intervention (Bjorkvist and Osterman, 1999; Salmivalli, 1999).

Sanchez (et al., in press) describes the ‘Texas study’ which comprised five components (staff training, curriculum, policy development, parent education and support services) also found that participants were better able to identify bullying behaviour and expressed a greater willingness to intervene on the victim’s behalf, but again results were not substantial. Programs such as these, which do not necessarily indicate substantial reductions in bullying behaviour, but which facilitate the capacity to identify such behaviour, may nevertheless make a valuable contribution to the work towards long-term intervention in peer abuse. Possibly such intervention outcomes reflect increased awareness, rather than increased instances of bullying.

The Macarthur Model differs from previous interventions in that it is a customised intervention based on research at the location that is interpreted by school staff and implemented by the school community. The six key components are conducted simultaneously over a long period of time and the policy, procedures and organisational changes implemented are based on school data. The Macarthur Model is presented as an application formulated for educational settings which enables schools to recognise, resist and respond appropriately and thoroughly to violence or bullying. Ideally, a systems approach should be established whereby each component of such a model is required of individual schools within a supportive macro-system of education. However, this level of commitment and service delivery is yet to be considered, in Australia. Whole education systems must commit to a comprehensive intervention at a state-wide level to the same extent as carefully designed syllabi in maths and English are logistically distributed and implemented.

Internationally, Olweus undertook a nationwide campaign in Norway which was government funded in 1983 (Olweus, 1999) and his work to date claims the greatest positive outcome of a 50% reduction in bullying in that country, thus demonstrating the success of systemic change. The new National Curriculum in Norway includes compulsory topics specifically related to bullying and Olweus and others (O’Moore, 2000) have also advocated for teacher training to incorporate bullying intervention strategies. The combination of strategies implemented in
Norway typifies the macro-system approach necessary for comprehensive intervention.

**Evaluations of Program Effectiveness**

A discussion of evaluations of effectiveness of anti-violence interventions is provided in Chapter 3. Bullying interventions have also been evaluated, most recently in Rigby's meta-evaluation of methods and approaches to reducing bullying in schools (2003). Rigby's report thoroughly examines the outcomes of thirteen programs, and his findings indicate a generally modest level of efficacy given that evaluations were seeking to identify reductions in bullying behaviour.

Effectiveness of intervention also needs to be assessed in the long-term as well as in the short-term, such as the duration of a program. Bullying is endemic in society. It is thoroughly embedded within our culture from kindergarten to the boardroom (McCarthy, 1996). To imagine that an intervention directed at a particular cohort of students in a specific school could have long-lasting effects is unrealistic. What we are really attempting to do is change an entire cultural orientation which supports and encourages individuals who seek and gain social advantage by engaging in abusive and anti-social behaviour. Social change of the magnitude addressed in anti-bullying intervention must be expected to take many years to reach fruition. The level of commitment required to negotiate changes to the bullying culture, which is so much a part of our society, is enormous. Evaluations of micro-system approaches will inevitably be disappointing when viewed in isolation. However, given the worldwide, persistent, research-based movement against sponsorship of bullying at all levels of society, we can expect change to eventuate in time. Evaluation, therefore, should not necessarily look to reducing bullying behaviours in the short-term only. Other important issues include raising awareness of the problem, identifying and differentiating bullying from other harmful behaviours, creating environments where reports of bullying are taken seriously, and discouraging the dominating behaviour of individuals. This will contribute over time to a society in which the abuse of peers is not accepted, tolerated or endorsed. Until bullies are seen in society as a whole as undesirable and bullying seen as abusive behaviour, small-scale interventions will continue to have limited effectiveness and we can expect decades of work ahead.
Evaluation of the Macarthur Model has been undertaken by examining the efficacy of components separately as well as by seeking a global testimony of efficacy. Other multi-faceted interventions have not been able to identify the most salient components critical to effectiveness (Rigby, 2003). This may be because all are contributory and also because of the relatively short period of time between intervention and evaluation. It may also be a consequence of a lack of clearly defined objectives. To address the latter, the Macarthur Model was grounded upon a series of specified objectives which are presented in the following section.

Objectives

The Macarthur Model is not a “prevention” intervention. This model is applied as a customised anti-bullying educational intervention devised to achieve specific, achievable, measurable objectives derived from research-based evidence in the particular setting. If the model were to be widely implemented in all schools, it would nevertheless be customised as the products and interventions initiated within the school will be defined by the data collected in the school, not by data collected in a range of unrelated schools. This is critical to the intervention as will be discussed further within the sections related to each component.

The objectives of the project were to ensure that participants who have engaged in training and implementation of the model will:

1. Demonstrate personal and interpersonal behaviours which indicate an acceptable level of respect for the safety of others in the particular setting, including appropriate verbal and physical interactions as well as acceptance of responsibility for protective intervention.
2. Demonstrate a knowledge of the indicators and characteristics of bullying behaviours as differentiated from conflict, fighting and reciprocal disputes.
3. Construct and distribute a specific anti-bullying policy statement based on data collected at the setting.
4. Implement organisational structures which provide support and protection for all members of the specific community including adequate supervision.
to discourage bullying; adjustments to programs, timetables and routines which facilitate protection and supervision; adequate resources for training personnel and community members; and reporting and investigative procedures which lead to individual intervention.

5. Develop, adopt and implement specific curricular materials and activities to provide education, knowledge and skills in relation to bullying.

6. Provide individual interventions for victims and perpetrators of bullying to develop appropriate behavioural responses.

The following section provides an overview of the model components and research products related to each component which validate the model and illustrate the efficacy and potential for future application.

Component 1: Determining the Nature and Parameters of Violence and Bullying in Schools

**Background**

Effective intervention to secure positive change in human behaviour must be predicated on an investigation of current levels of incidence and the parameters of the phenomena (Zirpoli & Melloy, 2002; Ashman & Elkins, 2003). The introduction of an intervention into a specific location or for a particular individual must be an outcome of thorough, research-based evidence of the current state of affairs. Surprisingly, few of the programs and interventions examined in the course of this program of research undertook this vital first step before devising and applying intervention strategies. Some researchers have accepted research evidence and attempted to apply it to intervention without consideration of the relevance or specificity to the particular setting or individual. Rigby (2003) states that “even though Australian educators can learn from the work conducted overseas, there is always the suspicion that generalisations across cultures may not be valid” (p. 18). It is proposed here that research findings, even within a specific culture, may not be relevant to a specific location, given the range of divergent gender, culture and administrative characteristics within and between settings. Therefore, interventions will be strengthened by a customised approach.
Component 1 of the Macarthur Model was incorporated later in the development of the intervention as a result of collaboration with schools and the special education pedagogical focus of the researcher. All remedial intervention in special education practice for learning and behavioural problems is based on thorough baseline data of current levels of functioning. This information provides the parameters for specific, measurable objectives for intervention and this approach is seen as critical to efficacy. Initially, a contribution was made to determining the nature and parameters of violence in schools through the provision of substantial submissions requested by government committees. In 1993, the Australian Commonwealth Government Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training conducted an inquiry into Violence in Australian Schools and utilised the definition provided in the author's submission (Jenkin, 1994, see Appendix 4.1.1) in the subsequent report “Sticks and Stones” (Australian Commonwealth Government, 1994, p. 1). In addition the author was quoted within the report and several of the twenty recommendations included in her submission were incorporated into the overall recommendations of the committee. The NSW Legislative Council conducted an inquiry in 1995 into Youth Violence in NSW and similarly acknowledged the submission and recommendations of the author throughout the report published in 1995 (see Appendix 4.1.2). Both of these submissions delineated an early but clearly focussed intervention philosophy which led in time to the model articulated here.

Other data were also examined in an attempt to establish the nature and parameters of aggressive behaviours. The paper published in the Journal of Educational Psychology in 2001 (see Appendix 4.1.3) was a culmination of several years of collaboration with colleagues Marsh, Parada and Yeung. The work involved an analysis of data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 of American students over a three year period (Ingles et al., 1992) examining the role of self-concept in aggressive interactions, an innovative perspective in regard to these issues.

During 1996-97, three schools requested assistance with devising intervention in relation to bullying. These schools were critically important to the evolution of the model as they provided the preliminary opportunity to contribute to the development of measures to determine the nature and parameters of bullying in schools. The
schools were a large regional high school in NSW and the feeder primary school in the same town, and a girls’ school in Ipswich Queensland. Each enabled the examination of data collection methodologies which led to the production of a specific measure which was highly applicable and user-friendly for school populations. The regional high school had produced a quite comprehensive format for data collection which included questions related to the cultural background of respondents which was ultimately incorporated into the School Safety Survey (see Appendix 2.1) form used for further research in this program and the formalisation of the research component of the model in regard to component 1.

**Context and Applications**

During 1998-2000, several further schools requested assistance to measure and intervene in bullying. Of these, three undertook to attempt all components of the Macarthur Model which had now evolved into a structured six component intervention. The process of collaboration and assistance in the schools took usually approximately six months from inception and was as follows:

1. In response to the schools’ request, executive staff were inducted at a half-day in-service where the components were introduced and a commitment made to participation. Schools also pledged to permit their data to be used in this program of research.

2. A survey was provided for the school along with instructions for dissemination and secure, confidential collection at the site.

3. A preliminary analysis of the raw data was undertaken in preparation for discussion at the whole-school training and education in-service.

4. A full-day, whole-school training and education in-service was presented for teaching and administrative staff, parents and community members. After providing information about bullying generally, the descriptive analyses of data were examined and discussed in structured workshops which are a feature of component 2 of the intervention, discussed further in this chapter.

5. A full analysis of the data in relation to gender, age and cultural factors and bullied status of respondents was carried out and a research report provided. (Analyses of this merged data are discussed in detail in Chapter 2).
Although the level of commitment to the model often declined over the period of participation, partly as a result of school-based pressures and partly because of the commitments of the researcher elsewhere, overall the process was well received and viewed as highly valuable in assisting schools to determine the nature and parameters of bullying in their location. Critical to the model is the fact that intervention planning is customised for the school and only the data from the school is considered as a basis for decisions related to responsive, protective and preventive strategies. As such, the process provided specific local data which differed between schools based on the cultural and socio-economic mix of respondents. All of the schools emerged from the in-service with information which contributed to the development of policy, information booklets and other useful products and specific intervention processes for application in their specific milieu.

Several papers were produced by this author which discussed specific aspects of the nature and parameters of the phenomena. In 1999, a paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand Institute of Criminology Conference in Brisbane examined bullying of Asian students (Jenkin, 1999, Appendix 4.1.4). This was seen as a topical analysis in light of recent political developments whereby ultra-conservative elements critical of Asian immigration were emerging on the political horizon. The paper was reviewed in the national press (see clipping included in Appendix 4.1.4). Additionally, the data were analysed in relation to cultural differences in resiliency for girls (Healey 2002b, see Appendix 3.7) and this paper was presented at the British Education Research Association conference in Exeter, UK in 2002. The data and conceptualisation of resiliency as a critical skill were seen as innovative contributions to the field of bullying intervention and research. In 2003, at the American Education Research Association Conference in Chicago, data from this research program related to student attitudes, experiences and perceptions in regard to bullying was presented with a colleague (Healey, Dowson & Bowen, 2003a, see Appendix 4.1.5). This paper was reviewed in the *Times Educational Supplement* (TES) in the UK (TES, 4532, 2002, 34). In each case the research effort was related to examining the nature and parameters of bullying and violence in school settings.

To evaluate the efficacy of component 1 a series of evaluation questions need to be considered by the school including: Was the survey properly conducted?, Were
the analyses of the data accurate and useful?, What key issues were identified in the
data in relation to experiences of bullying, attitudes towards bullying and the safety
of the school as perceived by students?, Do factors such as gender, cultural
differences, age or location effect outcomes in the data?, How is the research made
accessible to the school community?, and How informative is the data in relation to
intervention design?

Summary of Component 1

Determination of the nature and parameters of violence and bullying in
schools was seen as a critical component of a comprehensive intervention. Evidence
of the veracity of this as an important precursor to intervention is presented here. As
well, documentation of deeper analysis of a large quantity of data collected over
several years in a range of relevant settings is provided, including dissemination of
findings at international and local conferences. As has been discussed earlier in this
document, the data also revealed several new perspectives on bullying and violence
in schools which also contribute to advancing knowledge in the field. The appendices
in Component 1 provide evidence of a new approach and commitment to customised
research-based intervention. They also illustrate the outcome of local data collection
as a critical first step in the comprehensive intervention process.

Component 2: Education and Training Program for School Personnel,
Parents and Community Regarding Violence and Bullying in Schools

Background

Education with regard to bullying and violence in schools refers to the
acquisition of a breadth of knowledge about the phenomena. This is a critical
difference in the model presented here from other programs, in that the intention is to
procure long-term changes in attitudes, beliefs and knowledge, not immediate
reductions in levels of reported bullying. Indeed, in a comprehensive intervention it
may be expected that as participants become better informed, more assertive and
skilled at help-seeking and advocacy that reported bullying will increase in the short-
term. The intervention is not preventative but educative and, similarly to other major
shifts in social perceptions and practices such as those achieved for the women’s
movement, attitudes towards homosexuality and child abuse, the effort needs to be
long-term. It follows a discount -hierarchy philosophy which recognises that the existence of the problem, its impact and scope are not necessarily understood or accepted by all. It recognises also that having established its existence and seriousness, the program then needs to persuade participants of their responsibility to effect change in the behaviour. This is by no means achievable with facility or celerity in a short period of commitment. Such a program for education and change needs to ensure measurable objectives are established and monitored towards achievement. Within the in-service component of the model these objectives include:

1. Demonstrating an awareness and acceptance of the prevalence, impact and outcomes of bullying behaviours.
2. Recognising the definitive characteristics of behaviours which place them in the relevant category of violence and differentiate bullying from mutual conflict.
3. Demonstrating an understanding of the origins, motivations and reinforcing factors which sustain such behaviours.
4. Accepting responsibility for intervention.
5. Developing the skills and strategies for management of bullying or violence within the setting.
6. Monitoring and maintaining acceptable standards of behaviour in all relationships.
7. Contributing to the establishment of specific policy, procedures and intervention to address the problems identified in the local environment.
8. Establishing remedial, punitive, therapeutic and/or educational programs to ensure the safety and security of all members of the school community.

Each of these factors is addressed through this component of the Macarthur Model where the emphasis is very much on education for management. This component results in providing information, strategies and skills to whole school communities to enable them to recognise, resist and replace bullying and violence. It is presented to school staff, administrators, parents, community members and often student representatives as an educative process which prepares them to work together to address the problems identified in their specific environment.
Commitment to an educative rather than preventative or simply responsive approach was established early in the program of research. During 1995 an ambitious program of professional visits and lectures throughout the USA, Canada and the UK was undertaken in a period of sabbatical leave. This facilitated an extensive first-hand experience of a dozen bullying and violence prevention and intervention initiatives, programs and organisations (see Appendix 4.2.1.) During the process of investigation, it became evident that the focus on prevention was least efficacious in terms of outcomes. The endemic nature of the phenomena, embedded as they are in every aspect of interpersonal interaction in society, presents an enduring and unyielding barrier to prevention.

Programs which emphasise education and attempt to change attitudes towards bullying and violence were at least able to demonstrate increased knowledge and skills and improved attitudes about the behaviours as tangible outcomes. In terms of developing this component of the model, several programs influenced the philosophical and pedagogical emphases in the education program developed for the Australian context. However, issues raised by colleagues overseas revealed remarkable differences in the conceptualisation of what schools could tolerate, accept or expect from their students. During this program of visits, the Australian perspective was presented to a wide range of professional groups and validation of the model and the philosophical orientation was made possible. It was clear that without a structured, democratic, committed and comprehensive school approach, undertaken by educated personnel, the issues of violence and bullying could not be resolved.

Prior to the above trip, and on return to Australia, educational training in-services were presented to a range of organisations concerned with intervention and the model was further validated and endorsed. This involved health and mental health professionals, juvenile justice and corporate organisations each of whom requested a framework for intervention. In 1998 a grant was awarded by the University of Western Sydney to fund the implementation of an educational professional development program for pre-service teachers as an adjunctive program to their degree studies. This cohort of students, and many since, have graduated with an understanding of, and commitment to, the key issues in intervention in violence
and bullying in schools. Many researchers in the field view teacher preparation as a critical period for the development of the strategies and skills necessary to ensure effective intervention in schools (Bjorkqvist & Osterman, 1999; Faber-Cornaldi, Emin & Pain, 1999; Kallestad & Olweus, in press; O’Moore, 2000; Sullivan, 1998).

**Context and Applications**

The education program was extended and refined as an outcome of the international experience combined with previous and new research and work in the area. The program became known to schools and this resulted in requests for implementation in a range of schools more specifically at this time in relation to bullying. A manual for presentation was developed to facilitate this process (see Appendix 4.2.2 appended in volume 4) and document the procedures undertaken. The Macarthur Model is presented to school personnel as a carefully structured education program comprising the following processes and elements:

1. Induction of school executive following a request for assistance undertaken through an introductory half day information session outlining the Model and securing commitment to the program, as discussed in Component 1.

2. Distribution of the School Safety Survey throughout the school at a specified time and date with no prior knowledge of the contents of the questionnaire revealed to staff. No information regarding bullying or the intervention is provided to staff before collection of the data to ensure that students will not be coached or informed in such a way as to invalidate their personal responses.

3. The whole-school educational in-service is conducted soon after the data have been collected and undergone preliminary analysis.

**Components of the Manual for the In-Service Education Program**

The in-service education and training program is presented over one or two days to all members of the school community. For the purpose of this research program, the in-service was conducted by the researcher. However, the appended manual (Appendix 4.2.3 in volume 4) outlines all components of the model and guides school leaders in conducting the process within the school. Interested schools will in future be able to purchase the manual for independent implementation.
Section 1—Background and research about bullying. This part of the program provides participants with background information in relation to definitions of bullying, myths about bullying, indicators in bullies and victims in terms of overt behaviours, types of bullying, gender differences and recent research information from Australia and overseas. Participants utilise this information to compare the data from their own school with contemporary knowledge as a means of gauging the seriousness of the problem in their school.

Section 2—The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive Intervention. In this period of the program the model is presented and the comprehensiveness of the intervention explained.

Section 3—Results of the survey. A preliminary analysis of the data resulting from the survey of students at the school is presented according to several descriptive procedures including the year-level, gender and cultural differences. As well, bullied status of students is determined. Participants are always particularly interested to examine these outcomes and lively discussion often ensues which is preparatory for the next section. Staff have been involved in the simple analyses of data and the presentation of the overall results is a highly reinforcing event.

Section 4—Modules to customise policy, processes and products for the intervention at the school. A total of ten modules are provided and approximately six participants allocated to each group to undertake the prescribed tasks. The modules are presented with an information and instructional document, and the data relevant to the topic of the module in raw or preliminary analysis form. The workshop modules cover issues raised in the literature and the specific school setting as being influential or predictive of bullying. Workshop topics are specific and relate to particular factors of concern:

1. Interpersonal factors including teacher professional skills, student personal skills, verbal bullying, physical bullying, and personal or cultural bullying.

2. Environmental factors including out-of-class supervision.

3. Organisational factors including teacher intervention, documentation of incidents, and student involvement in intervention.
Each workshop module requires the participant group to discuss the school data in relation to their personal and professional knowledge about the students, the school and organisational and administrative processes. They are requested to record decisions to ensure tangible outcomes of the workshop discussions. There is a scaffold provided to guide this process, which includes requesting:

1. Philosophical or policy statements regarding the evidence presented in the data. For example, if the data indicate that interpersonal verbal abuse is a significant problem, then the group addressing verbal bullying would produce statements regarding the inappropriateness and unacceptability of this by students, staff or other community members. Obviously, since this process is undertaken in each group, as an outcome of the workshops there will be at least ten statements relevant to policy in the particular school which will form the foundation of the whole-school policy document. This shared responsibility and involvement ensures ownership of and commitment to the policy throughout the school.

2. Proposals for changes and additions to procedures and processes for management relevant to intervention in bullying in the school. This could include new reporting mechanisms, supervision routines, rules or other procedures which will facilitate monitoring, support and prevention. Once again, since each workshop group addresses this issue, there emerges a substantial list of such processes for implementation based on the school data.

3. Products developed for dissemination or display are encouraged. The team is requested to devise tangible products which can be used to address the issues raised in the data and in their workshop. Suggestions include an information booklet, one or two pages of which can be produced by each workshop team; posters depicting specific messages related to the workshop focus; reporting formats and other documentation; timetable and roster changes to restructure supervision and so forth.

As an outcome of participation in this process, the school is able to make progress in developing customised, research-based and focussed policy, procedures
and products specific to their own setting and identified needs. Guidelines are provided as to how to proceed to the next phase which involves a small number of working parties meeting to consolidate the contributions of each module team to the overall policy, process or product.

**Section 5—Curricular and individual interventions.** The final section of the in-service education program deals with presentation and discussion of available curricular materials, resources, and audio-visual supports for use with the whole student body. The Peer Advocacy programs (Healey, in press-a) are introduced as one methodology for preparing and educating students in bullying intervention. Additionally, staff are recruited to form a Peer Advocacy mentoring team to support implementation of this program is selected. Other programs often considered are the “Resolving Violence—Anti-Violence Curriculum” (Jenkin, 1996, see Appendix 4.5.1) and “Second Step Grades 8-10” program (Beland, 1989) and the “No-Blame Approach” (Robinson & Maines, 1997).

Individual interventions in the form of remedial, punitive and therapeutic programs for students involved in bullying as a victim or bully are also discussed in this section of the in-service. Often, the school counsellor is co-opted to suggest appropriate and specific interventions, to familiarise staff with appropriate programs and support relevant interventions for protecting and guiding these students. Participants are therefore fully apprised of the comprehensiveness of the Macarthur Model for intervention by the conclusion of the in-service.

To evaluate the efficacy of this component of the model a series of questions are examined including: How well does the in-service inform and educate participants in relation to a background knowledge about bullying or violence?, Are all participants aware of the components of the Model and the significance of each?, Do participants understand and accept the results of the school survey?, Do the outcomes of the workshops indicate a good understanding of the purpose and application of the data collected?, Were policy statements formulated?, Were products and procedures devised?, Was the necessity for a curriculum accepted and a decision taken about the program to offer?, Was there a commitment to the Peer
Advocacy mentoring team if this program selected?, and Was the need for individual intervention accepted and the support of the school psychologist confirmed?

**Summary of Component 2**

This component of the model provides all stakeholders with the opportunity to receive structured and customised information and education with regard to the phenomena of bullying in their milieu. It provides a scaffold for the development of whole-school policy and for organisational restructuring to address specific identified needs within the school. It also introduces participants to the need for curricula and individual interventions to ensure a comprehensive approach. The function of this component is to familiarise all relevant personnel with the components of the Macarthur Model for Intervention and to teach skills and information to facilitate and guide change. It is a critical component as it provides the foundation for all further intervention and decisions with regard to bullying.

**Component 3: Policy Development Related to Violence and Bullying in Schools**

**Background**

The need for macro-system policy to address the issue of bullying was recognised in the earliest days of international research into the impact of the phenomena. Dan Olweus began the journey for bullying researchers with his writings beginning in 1973 in Sweden. He very quickly secured political support for his research and intervention and the issue of bullying entered the national agenda. Internationally, the need for whole-school policy development has been widely acknowledged (Rigby, 1996; Smith, 1999; Sullivan, 1999).

**Context and Applications**

In 1994 a paper entitled “Structuring a Policy for a Non-Violent School” was presented at the Australian Institute of Criminology Second National Conference on Violence (Jenkin, 1994d, see Appendix 4.3.1). This paper proposed a framework for the composition of whole-school policy, which took account of a wide range of factors not previously thought be within the parameters of responsibility of schools. While the paper presented a procedure to address issues of violence in schools, it was
also eminently applicable to the development of anti-bullying policy, as it proposed a comprehensive structure addressing key elements of the organisation or school.

Designing a policy for a non-violent school reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members, in that they are making a conscious decision to manage their environment in a positive way. It also reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale and illustrates a philosophical commitment to equity by addressing the unequal power relationships between participants. The paper presented advocated that policy should (a) include specification of procedures, responsibilities and resources to facilitate maintenance of the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of all parties; (b) be designed to define relationships, acknowledge individual differences in ability, personal style and goals; and (c) state the training and support mechanisms which will ensure that all concerned have their legitimate needs met. While such a policy statement will clarify responsive procedures, the major thrust should be to record a practical and philosophical statement in relation to maintaining a safe and nurturing environment through the development of preventative attitudes, skills and knowledge. This component of the model advocates that the structure of policy should incorporate the following key elements.

**Philosophical Statement** The key to an effective philosophical statement within the policy document is that it be brief, coherent, comprehensive, accessible and data-based. The statement will emanate from the school community during the process outlined in component 2 of the Macarthur Model, when school personnel undertake structured workshops to devise, among other outcomes, specific statements about non-violence or anti-bullying. The philosophical basis of the policy emerges from examination of the qualitative data of the school which provides written comments from students.

Often, these reflect inappropriate attitudes and beliefs about bullying and violence which need to be addressed in the policy statement. It should be composed from input by staff, students and community members, and should reflect a genuine commitment and belief in relation to establishing a supportive and protective environment. The policy should be visible, accessible and consistently reinforced. To
this end, the philosophy underpinning the policy should be written in comprehensible terms for the population to which it is delivered. This would include simple and direct language which children and young people can interpret as well a range of culture-specific translations relevant to the population. The purpose of this section of the policy statement is to record the schools’ beliefs and commitment to safety and security. In particular this process for the development of a philosophical basis for anti-violence policy in schools should incorporate several principles including:

1. The inappropriateness of violence and bullying in any member of the school community including teachers and parents as well as students.
2. Recognising, identifying and recording the moral, legal and psychological rights of all school community members in a safe and nurturing environment.
3. Recognising, identifying and recording the moral, legal and psychological responsibilities of all school community members to interact in non-violent and non-bullying ways.
4. A categorical statement about specific behaviours which are seen as unacceptable and those which are expected in school community members.

Finally, the process outlined in the document for the development of a philosophical statement should also record the support structures available for individuals whose behaviour indicates that their personal philosophy of violence differs substantially from the community view.

**Personnel, Student and Community Considerations** This section of the policy statement describes processes for ensuring that a culture of non-violence will be encouraged by recruiting appropriate staff, encouraging and instructing students in appropriate behaviours and including community members who support the school’s anti-violence approach. It proposes identifying individual educational and psychological needs in students since those with unmet learning, social, emotional and sometimes physical impairment are more likely to be victims or perpetrators of violence and bullying (Goldstein & Huff, 1993; Lane, 1989; Rose, 1988). The foundation philosophy statement should also delineate the parameters of responsibility for teachers and the type, level and impact of parent and community members’ participation in the school.
**Programs, Strategies and Skills** Based on the information provided in the school data, the policy statement can also record the range of interventions and programs necessary to ensure a non-violent culture. These would include curricular, preventative, responsive, remedial and therapeutic interventions to facilitate the development and maintenance of a non-violent culture within the school. Within this section of the policy statement the selection of generic anti-violence and anti-bullying curricula would be recorded, and a commitment made to the incorporation of non-violent attitudes and messages throughout the curriculum. This approach is outlined in the Resolving Violence curriculum appended (Jenkin, 1996a, see Appendix 4.5.1.).

Additionally, a selection of personal development programs for all members of the school community can be offered as staff development programs and as focus topics for students in Personal Development, Health, and Physical Education curricula. It is also relevant for the school to consider the structure of their welfare and discipline policy, their punitive interventions and the applicability of suspension and expulsion provisions to ensure their relevance and effectiveness in addressing issues of violence and bullying.

**Processes for Implementation** The policy needs to determine the process of implementation of the decisions and programs stated in the policy. This would include organisational decisions regarding the roles and responsibilities of staff and students in maintenance of the policy as a dynamic and guiding document. It also refers to selecting and recording strategies and service-delivery modes, evaluation and review mechanisms and procedures for the continuous revision of documentation.

**Resources** Resources that will be provided to support the policy should be identified and recorded in this section of the policy statement. Many such documents founder when the resources, including human, material and administrative resources, promised in the initial flush of enthusiasm, do not eventuate. The recording of such resources in the policy statement indicates a commitment to the provision of the supports as a critical component of the policy. At the time that this proposal was presented, few professions had begun to address the need for such a wide-ranging statement of commitment to anti-violence or anti-bullying within their organisations.
A preliminary version of the process devised by the author had been incorporated into the NSW Department of Education portfolio “Resources for Teaching Against Violence” in 1991 which was distributed to all state schools.

Evaluation questions examining the efficacy of this component of the intervention include: To what extent have participants made a commitment to the guiding principles of policy development outlined in this component?; To what extent have participants worked together to formulate policy statements based on school data and the beliefs and principles of the school community?; Has a documented policy been produced as an outcome of the process?; and Is the policy in an accessible form for all members of the school community?

Summary of Component 3

The appended document outlines a specific framework for the development and production of a school-based policy stating a commitment to non-violence. The foundation for this process is outlined in component 2 of the Macarthur Model—the Education and Training in-service for school personnel and community members whereby school data is analysed and basic philosophical statements are produced during structured workshops. The policy represents a formal, fully documented commitment to all aspects of an anti-violence and anti-bullying culture within the school. It is not simply a statement of platitudes which cannot be measured or evaluated and which merely reflect hopeful ideals. The purpose of the policy statement produced as an outcome of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention is that it will provide guiding principles for the acquisition or establishment of defined data-based outcomes.

Component 4: Organisational Re-Structuring to Facilitate Intervention in Violence and Bullying in the School

Background

This component of the Model relates to processes within schools which may need to be re-evaluated, restructured or revised in the light of school-based research. Survey responses gathered in component 1 of the model, determining the parameters and nature of the behaviours in the school, often indicate problematic factors in the
environment, interpersonal relationships, administrative and academic processes which may inhibit intervention or even facilitate violence and bullying. Rigby (1996), in his model of factors influencing children’s peer relations, mentions school ethos and the educational climate as well as policy as being relevant to intervention. Olweus, (1993) discusses the importance of vigilant supervision and teacher intervention as a means of indicating an anti-bullying attitude. Goldstein and Kodluboy (1998) express dismay, but not surprise, at the presence of such aggressive activities as gang membership within schools. They strongly advocate controlling the school environment through the implementation of “prevention and implementation procedures, educational activities, physical structures, adult and student behavioral expectations, and parent and community partnerships” (p. 133).

Overall, researchers are in agreement that schools are capable of addressing violence and bullying in their midst with a co-operative and determined effort. However, if measurable change is to be effected, contributory elements must be carefully quantified and deliberately targeted. “School climate” is merely a generalisation unless it can be examined in terms of components such as student and teacher attitudes, behaviour and fears, administrative processes which facilitate support, protection for school community members and an ongoing commitment to improving relationships and structures within the school. Intervention in violence and bullying must be grounded in a thorough understanding of current dimensions of interpersonal, administrative, educational and physical factors which influence its development.

Context and Applications

For schools implementing the Macarthur Model, their own research data provides the foundation for this component. Specific questions in the survey questionnaire yield quantitative and qualitative information regarding locations, perpetrators, teacher responses and administrative structures which impact on the maintenance of violence and bullying. In the research data analyses, clear indications of the perceived level of seriousness of the problem (question 5), the capacity and willingness of teachers to intervene (question 6), students’ beliefs about school climate (question 7) and the physical areas in which the activities take place (question 10) are identified. The differences between schools in relation to responses
to these questions illustrate the differences in emphasis necessary for effective intervention for each individual setting. These were notified to schools through the research reports provided.

As discussed in component 2, the process for undertaking organisational restructuring begins in the workshop sessions during the education and training in-service. The manual outlining this in-service (see Appendix 4.2.3) gives details of workshop activities and outcomes related to the identification of school and external locations, environmental factors and teacher supervision and intervention relevant to this component. Once identified, it is expected that the school will establish structures for management and prevention of the inappropriate activities through changes to such elements as supervision timetables, procedures for reporting and documentation of incidents, as well as monitoring and controlling movement about the school to ensure privacy and protection where necessary. A critical application of this component is in the structure and maintenance of an effective welfare and discipline policy within the school which provides for remedial and therapeutic behavioural intervention as well as the usual punitive and exclusionary elements which generally underpin such programs. It needs to be noted however, that suspension and exclusion provisions do not address the underlying issues of peer abuse nor the individual needs for intervention for the bully or victim. Such processes should only be implemented as a component of pastoral care and welfare procedures.

During the process of developing the Macarthur Model, the assistance of the author was sought by the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice to provide training and education for staff and executive engaged to establish a new program and facility specifically for violent young offenders from detention centres throughout NSW. The Robinson Unit was established in November 1994 to accommodate juveniles who had been incarcerated in various detention facilities for particularly violent offences including rape and murder. These young offenders were to be transferred from the facility in which they were currently housed to the maximum security Robinson Unit within the Reiby detention centre in outer western Sydney. Appendix 4.4.1 in volume 4 is a manual developed by the author to assist in the comprehensive restructuring of current approaches to management of such offenders in detention facilities. It was
felt that a more intensive, measurable and thoroughly documented program of
intervention should be established to provide the necessary opportunity for behaviour
change for these individuals. The process describes a linear methodology for
intervention which provides increasing levels of support, supervision and instruction
for those identified as in need. It would also provide substantial documentation of the
types, intensity and frequency of violent or bullying behaviours in this population.
The manual documents a training program for executive and staff at the facility to
enable the development of appropriate skills, attitudes and procedures for
management. This is an example of organisational restructuring at a much more
intensive and systems-based level than would be anticipated for schools, nevertheless
it is an effective means of illustrating the comprehensive nature of this component.

An understanding of the basic elements of the behaviour that can be expected
of young people in a specialist, high security detention facility, is fundamental to a
successful programme of intervention. Personnel involved with such young people
are expected to establish and maintain successful therapeutic and socially supportive
relationships as well as to provide a safe and secure environment. They must take
account of the psychological, moral, emotional and cognitive developmental needs of
the detainee, and demonstrate cultural empathy and awareness. Further, personnel
must develop competencies in identifying, analysing and addressing a range of
challenging behaviours through the application of systematic procedures including
data collection, program design and implementation.

At the executive level, leadership in establishing and maintaining staff
commitment, skills and morale is essential. This program attempted to address these
matters in a manner in which the organisation had not previously attempted.
Intervention was premised on the baseline data provided by the department of the
types and frequency of incidents involving the individuals and indeed their transfer
to the Unit was in response to their problematic behaviours. The key elements of this
organisational restructuring program were:

Module 2: Designing and Implementing a Remedial Behaviour Monitoring
Program.
Each module was presented at Level 1 for youth workers, teaching staff and counsellors, and at Level 2 for executive and senior administrative staff. The content of each module is specified for the range of personnel involved in the design and their role in implementation of the behaviour monitoring system developed. Those in daily contact with the detainees needed different preparation than those whose responsibility it was to oversee the behaviour of both clients and staff. It was a major goal of this training program to develop a management system which would comprehensively serve the needs of all concerned for safety, security and progress towards re-integration into the mainstream of detention. The restructuring process was conducted with staff and executive in line with their expressed requirements for a therapeutic and remedial approach to accompany the usual and indeed legislated, punitive intervention applied in such settings. The manual describes a framework for in-house development of “Whole Unit Progressive Behaviour Monitoring Plan” which attempts to take into consideration the key elements of supervision, documentation, and specific notified behavioural criteria. Fundamental to the efficacy of such a plan is a consistent, predictable and objective set of guidelines notified to all participants which establishes a specific pathway to successful graduation from the program.

The removal of arbitrary and subjective decision-making in regard to punitive interventions, in particular, was critical to the integrity of the plan. The plan represented a major shift in the philosophical and pragmatic orientations of unit staff. This is a feature of this component of the Macarthur Model which is often cathartic and seldom introduced without some resistance. When staff are required to address their own behaviours and practices and to engage in thorough introspection with regard to their decision-making skills and attitudes, resistance often occurs. Nevertheless, it is critical to organisational restructuring that poor or ineffective practices be challenged and subjected to intensive scrutiny during the process. To this end, in this particular case of organisational restructuring, a specific checklist was devised to facilitate staff self-assessment of personal competencies. It was introduced in an attempt to assist staff to identify and acquire appropriate personal competencies and skills to ensure effective, fair and accountable management of this particular clientele.
In 1996, at the Australian Council for Educational Research National Behaviour Problems Conference, a paper was presented describing the program and offering a two-year follow-up evaluation of efficacy (Jenkin, 1996b, see Appendix 4.4.2). Although the plan had mutated substantially from that developed as an outcome of the training sessions, the overall verdict was that the approach was relevant and more empathetic than those generally employed in the management of young detainees with extremely problematic behaviour. The application of the organisational re-structuring component of the Macarthur Model was, in this case, particularly successful. In the case of school-based intervention, the application may differ in terms of outcomes in that they may not result in such a comprehensive restructuring of philosophy and practice. However, the processes involved whereby staff and management co-operatively devise a system for intervention and management can be duplicated in any school.

Evaluating this component of the model involves addressing such questions as: Have organisational processes which seem to facilitate or contribute to the continuation of bullying or violence in the school been identified and recorded?; Have such elements been categorised into environmental, interpersonal and administrative deficits which can be addressed through team collaboration?; Have new and specific processes and procedures for reporting, documenting and intervention been determined?; Have supervision timetables and parameters been reviewed?; and Has consideration been given to the roles and functions of staff in relation to protective supervision?

Summary of Component 4

This component of the Macarthur Model addresses the issue of change management in restructuring organisational practices in order to prevent and intervene in violence and bullying in the setting. This is applicable whether the behaviours are extreme, expected and legally punishable as is the case described here, or are elements of student interactions which a school desires to alter. The intensity and comprehensiveness of restructuring within the organisation is relative to the complexity and seriousness of the problematic behaviours uncovered through research. It may also be dependent upon the perceived or actual leadership style within the school or organisation (Barnett, Marsh, & Craven, in press; Bass & Avolio,
1994). This component is by far the most challenging aspect of intervention in violence and bullying, but can result in long-term improvement for all concerned.

Component 5. Curricula for all Students Regarding Violence and Bullying in School

Background

The function and purpose of this component of the model is to ensure that all students in a given school population receive information with regard to the origins, types, impact and consequences of violence and bullying in society and their interpersonal relationships as a component of their education program. As a foundation pedagogical principle, it is unreasonable to expect behaviour change to eventuate in the absence of relevant knowledge and skills. Even so, as with all curricular content delivered in an educational context, behaviour change cannot be expected without generalisation training, ongoing reinforcement and adequate revision.

As discussed earlier in this document, a plethora of programs exist for delivery to broad populations of students at the whole-school level in primary and secondary schools in relation to violence and bullying. Most of these programs have been produced overseas, but during the process of staff education and training, several generic curricula are discussed including “Aggression Replacement Training” (Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs, 1998) and in particular the Second Step programs, (Beland, 1989a; 1989b) are recommended for application. In the Australian context the published Resolving Violence curriculum included in this portfolio and the Peer Advocacy program developed by the author are proposed as appropriate to the purpose.

Three programs are described here:

2. "Bullybusters"—an anti-bullying initiative devised to assist primary students to recognise, resist and replace bullying behaviours (see Appendix 4.5.2).

3. "Peer Advocacy"—a supportive and functional intervention to assist victims of bullying in secondary schools (Healey, in press-a, in press-b, see Appendix 4.5.4).

These represent approaches to intervention in violence and bullying in schools which are delivered to the whole-school population or to nominated senior or junior groups, in order to define and address the relevant issues in terms that are comprehensible to students. The curricular programs have been developed over many years and require further development in the case of the latter two programs but are presented to illustrate the composition of such interventions for school populations.

**Context and Applications**

"Resolving Violence—An Anti-Violence Curriculum for Secondary Students" (see Appendix 4.5.1) is specifically devised for adolescents. Since young people, and in particular young males, are most at risk from a violent death in modern society and are most at risk from each other, such a program of information seems imperative. Clearly, an intervention designed to bring this information to their conscious attention was needed and this curriculum was devised to provide the relevant statistical and factual information, skills and attitudes necessary to develop an anti-violence orientation in participants.

The curriculum differs from others in that it also recognises gender differences in experiences of violence. Analysis of violence in society makes it quite evident that the majority of incidents involve young males as perpetrators or victims and that females are far more likely to be victimised than to engage in violence. The curriculum, if delivered in co-educational settings is partially delivered in gender-segregated groups which facilitates open and confident discussion of particular issues in the absence of the other gender. A thorough discussion of this rationale is incorporated in the curriculum appended. Particular emphasis is placed on help-seeking and assertiveness for females and an attempt is made to assist them to locate the locus of control for survival of violence firmly within their own capabilities. Male participants receive clarification of the legal implications for violent behaviours and information about the development of appropriate self-control and conflict
resolution strategies. They are introduced to concepts of assertiveness which suggest that strength and masculinity are not compatible with violence towards others, in particular women and children. The restructuring of pro-violent attitudes based on specific information and instruction is a key focus of the program.

Three instruments for measurement of change and introspection were developed for use with this curriculum. The *Attitudes Towards Violence* instrument is used to record expressed attitudes and pro-violent orientations prior to and following the program; the *Concepts Acquisition Questionnaire* is applied to determine the degree to which objectives, information, and skills were achieved; and the *Relating to Others Scale* is used to assist students to recognise their own personal response style and to select for intervention or change, behaviours they view as undesirable in the light of new information and attitudes. The curriculum has been in production since 1996 and has been widely distributed in Australia and internationally.

In 1996, the curriculum was presented in a paper at the Australian Council for Educational Research National Behaviour Management conference and subsequently published in the conference proceedings (Jenkin, 1996c, see Appendix 3.3). This paper documents the objectives of the program and outlines the preliminary work in trialling and evaluating the curriculum in a juvenile justice detention centre, an adult gaol, and participant high schools prior to publication.

"Bullybusters—A Model for Intervention and Resilience" was presented at the National Protective Behaviours conference in Canberra in 1995 (Jenkin, 1995b, see Appendix 4.5.3) where an outline of the components and philosophy of the program was publicly revealed. Unfortunately, some time thereafter both the name and the content were adopted by an organisation in another state and trademarked to prevent the authors’ use of the title. This has not prevented the further development of the curriculum and consideration of a a new name—“Defenders” to launch the curriculum in primary schools. Appendix 4.5.2 presents an outline of the curriculum in progress and the products planned for use in the intervention. The curriculum was devised to be a novel and compelling means of delivering the strategies, information and skills that young children require to resist and avoid being bullied. The curriculum is staged over a whole term of activities and specific lessons and
comprises three levels of competency, Apprentice, Deputy and Bullybuster, each level requiring demonstration of particular skills and knowledge following a series of lessons and practice sessions. There are several key personal competencies to be developed or acquired during the course of the program: introspection, empathy, tolerance, assertiveness and resiliency and several interpersonal competencies Recognising bullying, taking responsibility, help-seeking, reporting and peer advocacy. Children in the middle and upper years of primary education are suitable candidates for this program.

Peer Advocacy (Healey, in press-b) developed as a functional approach to resisting bullying in response to data which indicated that peer attitudes and unsupportive behaviours where instrumental in perpetuating bullying in schools. This program has been discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Appendix 4.5.4 outlines the specific content and processes of the approach, however without peer review, publication and professional recognition of the feasibility and applicability of the process, the program will require further development for implementation and evaluation. Papers outlining the structure of the program and the theoretical underpinning have both been accepted for presentation at the Self-Concept Enhancement and Learning Facilitation (SELF) Research Centre International Conference to be held in Berlin in July 2004 and it is anticipated that further development of the program will be facilitated and guided by peer feedback at this event. The program structure is outlined in Appendix 4.5.4 and the theoretical structure in Appendix 3.9, where the theoretical construct presented provides a sound foundation for development and the application of the program to train peers to offer support and to advocate on behalf of victims of bullying. Children in the upper levels of primary school and lower secondary are suitable candidates for this program.

Evaluation of this component of the model involved addressing questions such as Are participants familiar with a range of programs available to teaching skills and information regarding violence and bullying in schools?, Has a decision been taken with regard to the program to be offered to all students?, and Have implementation arrangements been discussed and determined?
Summary of Component 5

This component of the Macarthur Model proposes generic curricula be presented to the whole-school population to provide information and skills to address the issues. There are numerous programs available for purchase, however, caution is urged in the selection of programs. Those which can provide specific achievable and measurable behavioural objectives and a means for measurement of acquisition of these are most likely to demonstrate efficacy in terms of understanding and rejecting violence and bullying. Several of these are recommended in the education and training in-service program offered to schools. However, in addition, as an outcome of the research undertaken in schools to determine the parameters and nature of these phenomena, three curricula, which are applicable to school populations from early primary to senior secondary, have been developed in this portfolio of work. The most successful of these to date has been the Resolving Violence curriculum, but there is clear support for the other programs and further development is planned.

Component 6. Individual Interventions for Students Involved in Violence and Bullying in Schools

Background

Individual interventions are critical to the efficacy of the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in violence and bullying in schools. They should address the specific needs for protection and monitoring of students involved in the violence and bullying paradigms and facilitate the acquisition of appropriate personal skills. Both perpetrators and victims require individual intervention to interrupt the vortex of aggressive and damaging interactions which results in harm for all concerned. Bullies and violent individuals are in grave danger of becoming criminally liable for their behaviours, and their violent orientations invariably lead to some form of legal intervention, often in the early teen years (Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs, 1998; Spatz-Widom, 1995). Goldstein et al. refer to the complex nature of aggressive behaviour and state: “It is simultaneously a behavioral, cognitive and emotional phenomenon. So, too, must be the interventions designed to address it” (p. 1). Victims of violence are often randomly selected and unfortunate to be the opportunistic target of the violence. At other times their selection is quite deliberate as in the case mentioned earlier in this document of the young girl
assaulted with a cross-bow at school because she had ended a relationship with the violator. Violent individuals have been seen as in need of empathy training and social skills programs, impulse control, conflict resolution and anger management training to broaden their repertoire of appropriate interaction behaviours. Specific programs utilised with aggressive individuals and subsequently recommended to schools for inclusion in this component of intervention for individuals include “Aggression Replacement Training” (Goldstein, et al., 1998).

Bullies are differentiated from episodically violent individuals in that they have adopted an interpersonal interaction style which relies on dominance and coercion, often with the support and encouragement of those in close social and physical proximity. They have the social approval that violent individuals can never achieve. The difference lies in personal characteristics and style which often afford the bully a reputation for being a popular individual despite their abusive behaviours. Violent individuals rely on instilling fear and anxiety as a means of boosting self-esteem (Marsh et al., 2001) and do not appear to possess the socially acceptable personal characteristics to secure peer approval. Bullies have mistakenly been viewed in the past as in need of social skills training. It is self-evident that the success of the bully in maintaining their social status despite engaging in highly inappropriate social behaviour indicates that their social competency is not in question. It is their lack of social and interpersonal responsibility and empathy that needs to be addressed. Nor is anger management helpful to the bully since their behaviour is often not motivated out of a sense anger but of enjoyment in inflicting harm. Conflict resolution skilling is not an appropriate intervention for this group either. Bullying is not conflict and therefore to address the issue with conflict resolution strategies is inappropriate (see Healey, 2002c, Appendix 3.8).

Bullies and their victims do not have equivalence in the abusive relationship. Just as it would be inappropriate to suggest that children or women involved in abusive domestic relationships should engage in conflict resolution with their abuser, so too it is inappropriate to suggest that victims of bullying are equally culpable with bullies. Conflict resolution is only appropriate when two parties are seeking to have their needs and desires met at the expense of the other and each struggles for dominance.
The bullying paradigm comprises two or more individuals in a situation whereby the purpose of the behaviour of the bully or bullies is to dominate and subjugate the victim. What differentiates the victim from the perpetrator is the lack of reciprocal efforts to harm the bully, due often to the fear and anxiety experienced similarly to an abused spouse or child. Despite some attempts to utilise conflict resolution as an intervention in bullying it is essentially an inappropriate interpretation of the behaviours and is yet to be thoroughly discussed in the literature. Bullies require empathy training and structured behavioural programs which reinforce appropriate interactions and result in loss of status and power for misdemeanours. Victims of bullying often require, in particular, training in assertiveness and communication skills, as well as help-seeking and resiliency instruction.

**Context and Applications**

There are many self-improvement programs available for application within schools as part of a comprehensive approach to intervention. This component of the model requires school communities to identify and individualise interventions to assist victims and perpetrators. Violent individuals are often identified through critical incident reports and suspension and exclusion records within schools. Traditionally they have been excluded from school for brief periods of suspension and then reinstated with the hope that their attitudes and their behaviour will have been changed by the experience. Unfortunately, suspension is a notably ineffectual practice for precipitating change since no remedial intervention is offered to instruct the student in behaviour change during the period out of school. At best, it is a time-out period undertaken to allow all parties to recover. Early in this program of research, a specific model for suspension support was devised and offered to schools for application in circumstances where individual students were recalcitrant or particularly difficult to manage. The Macarthur Suspension Support Project was funded by a university grant and offered by the researcher to schools when a student suspension was imminent. It was premised in the argument that it is pedagogically indefensible to suspend children and young people from school and to deny them access to education support when their behaviour indicates an obvious need for
intensive intervention and training within the educational environment. This project offered an alternative to out-of-school suspension by providing a documented and supported intervention in three phases.

1. *Pre-Suspension Support* whereby preventative programming is instituted when the student is in imminent danger of suspension.

2. *In-school Suspension Support* which offers specific behaviour training during an period of supervised isolation in school while under suspension.

3. *Suspension Support* during which time the student receives remedial educational programming and behaviour instruction prior to re-instatement in the school.

A good deal of media interest was generated by the project (see clippings included in Appendix 4.6.). In 1994, the expanded model of the suspension support program was presented in a paper (Jenkin, 1994e, see Appendix 4.6.1) at the Australian Council for Educational Research National Conference for Behaviour Management and Behaviour Change for Children and Youth with Emotional and/or Behaviour Problems, and subsequently published in proceedings. In this document the notion of suspension as a remedial rather than a merely punitive intervention was discussed. In terms of this component of the Macarthur Model, it provides a framework for individual intervention for students who would not otherwise receive this support.

Intervention with individuals involved in bullying as either a victim or perpetrator needs to be addressed in the comprehensive approach recommended. The proposition that resiliency can be taught to individuals who do not demonstrate a natural capacity for recovery from abuse and adversity has been discussed in chapter three. This notion was further explored in a paper discussing bullying and resiliency presented at the National Protective Behaviours Conference in 2002 (Healey 2002a, see Appendix 4.6.2) in which a model for individual intervention was outlined for victims. The victim model incorporated into this paper describes the differences in the capacities of victims to resist the bully along a continuum from passivity and surrender to resilience and recovery. This model is further articulated in the appendices related to Peer Advocacy. It illustrates the changes in behaviour and status which can be anticipated as the individual acquires skills through a supportive program of intervention and instruction.
It is important to differentiate factors associated with resilience from actual resilient behaviours in an attempt to adapt resiliency to bullying intervention. If we accept that certain factors correlate with resilience in individuals who have been thus identified—factors such as higher IQ, self-esteem, school performance and social competence (Kinard, 1998)—we may be reluctant to include young people who do not have these attributes in our efforts to develop resilient behaviours. While it may be easier to teach resilient behaviours such as help-seeking and assertiveness to individuals who have higher IQ’s, self-regard and social functioning, it is important that the skills be also introduced to victims who do not have the attributes as it is possible that some of these may ensue following resiliency training.

Differentiating the key factors correlating with resilience from the behaviours indicative of resiliency is a critical factor in effective intervention. The terms resiliency and thriving are often used interchangeably, but can be differentiated essentially on the basis that thriving can develop in the absence of adversity, while resiliency is only identified in terms of adverse experiences. Unless or until the individual is placed under stress, the competencies of resiliency are not required. However, thriving is often a continuous process illustrating a relatively uninterrupted life course leading to social and emotional competency. For victims of bullying, it may be that developmental thriving will facilitate resiliency development if none has previously been demonstrated. This theoretical premise is the foundation of the module incorporated into the Bullybuster/Defenders program (see Appendix 4.5.3) for all students and it is here that the requisite identifying capacities of individuals are first noted in order that they may be included in an individual intervention if needed.

Questions evaluating this component of the model include: Have individuals been identified through the survey or other means who require intervention for victimisation?, Have individuals been identified through the survey or other means who require intervention for being abusive towards peers?, Have specific interventions been considered to remediate the personal and interpersonal skills of these individuals?, and Have measures of effectiveness been considered for determining the acquisition of new and functional behaviours by these individuals?
Summary of Component 6

This component of the Model recognises the different needs of individuals involved in the bullying paradigm or in violence. A range of interventions focused specifically on identifiable deficits in the interpersonal and social skills and performance of such individuals is discussed. At the school level such students and others who bully or are bullied, or who engage in violence must be located through the survey or another process, and their needs addressed.

The intervention may involve customised programs designed to improve specific aspects of interaction, and offer remedial instruction in the acquisition of new behaviours. Alternatively the program may be embedded within the structures of the school designed to manage student behaviour such as suspension support. As a component of the Macarthur Model, individual interventions must take precedence if individuals are identified in the survey results. This component represents a critical aspect of whole-school intervention.

Evaluation of the Model

The purpose of the overall evaluation of the model is to determine the efficacy, impact, outcomes and relevant processes of the intervention. It is to measure change in behaviour and attitudes, knowledge and information. The purpose of the evaluation is not to record prevention of bullying. The most that can be expected is that changes in expressed attitudes will result in positive changes in behaviours for all concerned (Sax, 1979). To this end, the evaluation questions need to provide guidance for the maintenance, modification or implementation of aspects of the intervention as well as the intervention as a whole. Each component of the Model is therefore evaluated with reference to the stated objectives. At issue here is the integrity of the intervention process in effecting positive behavioural change of benefit to participants. Assumptions cannot be made about the efficacy of the model nor the benefits without systematic evaluation. The process of evaluation for this program comprises three phases.
Component Evaluation: Following completion of each component of the model, the prescribed evaluation questions must be addressed and the results reported to the school community. Component 1 evaluation is conducted following collection and preliminary data analyses. These results are reported during Component 2 during the whole-school information session. Component 2 evaluation is conducted on completion of the workshops which formulate policy and procedures. Component 3 evaluation is conducted after the policy, products and processes have been developed and disseminated. The commitment and awareness levels of stakeholders are assessed at this evaluation point. Component 4 evaluation takes place following organisational restructuring when new systems for reporting and monitoring such matters as supervision, documentation and movement about the school are in place. This evaluation assesses the impact and resultant behavioural changes, and it is anticipated will reveal increased reports of bullying in response to the new procedures. Component 5 evaluation is conducted as an element of the curriculum applied for student education and training in regard to bullying. Finally, Component 6 is evaluated in relation to individual indicators following the application of individual interventions for addressing bully and victim behaviours.

Intervention Evaluation: There is a need to evaluate the overall impact and outcomes of the whole intervention to assess changes in school climate, structures and processes. This should be undertaken when the whole process has been implemented. Changes to incidents, frequencies and types of bullying and changes in attitudes and beliefs should be positively correlated with intervention processes. This may not mean reductions in reported incidents. Evaluation questions which need to be answered at this point include: In what ways are reported incidents indicative of changes to the reporting of type, frequency or impact of bullying?, Have reports of bullying increased in response to the new reporting procedures?, Have attitudes towards bullying been measurably changed in a positive direction?, What has been the impact of student involvement in intervention?, and Specifically, how successful has the Peer Advocacy program been if implemented?
**Review Evaluation** This should be undertaken approximately twelve months after full implementation of the model utilising the survey. If conducted at the end of the school year such an evaluation would capture all of the original participants. While matched responses are not possible to identify since all participants are anonymous, general trends indicating greater awareness of bullying, greater willingness to report and help, and expressions of belief in the improved safety of the environment would be indicative of successful long-term intervention. Evaluation questions to be addressed at this time include: Are the results of survey two quantitatively different to those in survey one?, Are there differences in types and frequency of reported bullying?, Are the results in survey two qualitatively different to those in survey one in that attitudes and beliefs about bullying reflect support for victims and rejection of bullies or bullying?, and Is the intervention complete, ongoing or stalled?

**Summary**

This chapter presented the Macarthur Model for Customised Intervention in Schools and delivered a structure for addressing bullying or violence within the school which is widely applicable. The model is premised on the notion that intervention must be research-based and in this instance must be based on a knowledge of the bullying and violence phenomena generally but in particular based on local school data. This is addressed in component 1 of the model. The literature is very clear in asserting the need for whole-school community involvement and education with regard to these issues and this is addressed in component 2. A process for the development of specific policy for formalising school and community expectations with regard to eliminating bullying and violence, and procedures for proactive management are addressed in components 3 and 4. Component 5 of the model recommends the comprehensive education of students in appropriate skills and knowledge through generic curricula, and several are identified and have been specifically developed for this portfolio of work. Finally, the needs of those being victimised and of those whose behaviour poses a threat to the safety or well-being of others in the environment are addressed through individual interventions outlined in component 6.
The model represents a refinement of intervention practice which has been developed over a number of years and validated through research. A key strength of this model is the customised approach based on data collected and analysed within the school. The comprehensiveness of the intervention in addressing all of the nominated components in the particular setting as a customised approach for the given population is what differentiates it from other models and approaches. The model is both an extension of work to date on whole-school intervention and also contributes an holistic response. This is achieved through a thoroughly researched and structured methodology which pays attention to the detail of the intervention. This ensures that schools can implement effective intervention in a supported yet independent manner customised to their own identified requirements.
CHAPTER 5
Discussion, Implications and Summary

Introduction

Bullying and violence represent the greatest challenges to educational institutions of the next decade. Despite substantial research, analysis and intervention at all levels of education, the endemic, enduring nature of bullying and the tragically episodic nature of school violence continue as destructive forces. This provides a compelling focus, not seen traditionally as educational, which will be an essential component of any education program in the future. The issues of violence and bullying in schools are inexorably linked to their manifestation in society as a whole. Schools and school children do not function in isolation from their communities. Addressing these issues is therefore a shared responsibility. This document has explored violence in schools and its relationship to violence in the community, both here and overseas. It has examined bullying as a school phenomenon and as a social more. Such comparisons have revealed new perspectives for consideration and have informed the development of a comprehensive approach to intervention. They have also identified the need for new directions for research and for educational planning.

Some progress towards addressing these matters has been made over the past decade. Educators and researchers have determined that being abused by peers is not an acceptable nor natural part of “growing up”. Attempts have been made to seek out and implement protective, supportive and informative interventions to ensure the safe passage of children and young people through their education. Recognising, resisting and attempting to replace bullying behaviours, which in the recent past may well have been rewarded as leadership indicators in particular individuals, is now a common component of education and schooling. The Columbine High School massacre in April 1999 in Colorado—the “9/11” of education—also helped educators realise that unimaginable violence is indeed a possibility that must be pro-actively managed within education systems in the future. Preventative administrative and educational programs to address the threats of violence and abuse, and to implement protective and restorative interventions in the wake of such events, are now becoming formalised and structured. The essence of education remains the
transmission of knowledge, but the nature of the knowledge has been changed forever to include the darker side of human interactions. It is hoped that this portfolio of educational research and intervention will contribute to a long-term solution to these problems.

**Discussion of Findings**

Findings in this portfolio relate to statistically significant data analyses which validate and extend previous research and support a commitment to customised intervention in schools and other organisations. More importantly, findings relate to new theoretical perspectives and an understanding of the psychology of peer abuse which validate the educational approach to violence and bullying intervention. Episodic violence such as has been discussed may never be preventable, nor may persistently harmful bullying, but establishing an informed response based on an understanding of their origins may well reduce the psychological impact and outcomes for all involved.

**Research Data Findings**

The substantial database of responses from students experiencing bullying in secondary schools yielded results supportive of previous research. These included gender and age differences as well as some evidence of differentiated experiences based on country of origin. Most importantly, however the data provided support for the need for a customised intervention as it clearly exposed differences between schools in terms of the types, frequency impact and outcomes of bullying. This validated the focus of the manual for intervention which guides the school through a process which adapts intervention to local needs.

The data also identified the fact that some schools are effective in their responses to students, and are perceived as generally safe and supportive. The elements of programs offered at these schools could inform others for their own intervention.
New Theoretical Perspectives

This document proposes new viewpoints, some of which may be seen as controversial, for consideration in the development of theory and practice in relation to violence and bullying in schools. As an outcome of experience, practice and research in a wide range of educational environments the issue of peer abuse as a child protection issue and a focus for legally mandated reporting in serious cases is proposed. The perceived strong influence of simulated media violence on the behaviour of most young people and as a causal factor in violence and bullying in schools is rejected in this work. This is in view of the stronger evidence that real life experiences often reinforce and provide opportunities for the development of violent and bullying behaviours in a small minority of young people. The proposal that an educational rather than preventative approach is the critical focus for intervention programs is also canvassed in this work, given that learning is critical to the manifestation of such behaviours. Evaluation of interventions rarely establishes that prevention has been achieved, whereas education for non-violence and anti-bullying attitudes and knowledge can be readily measured and evaluated. Similarly, the impact of peer involvement is acknowledged as a critical and positive influence and formalised in the Peer Advocacy program. This adds a new and more formal dimension to peer involvement which recognises that to be efficacious, the environment in which peer assistance is sought and offered must be supportive. This program provides guidelines for seeking further assistance when the authorities to whom appeals are made for intervention do not respond in an appropriate or timely or effective fashion. A further educational element found to be relevant is introduced in this document—that of resiliency as a learned skill. The necessity for the development of the skill is discussed at length in appended documents and the fundamental elements of resilient behaviours described and discussed in the context of a specific intervention program in both Peer Advocacy and the Bullybusters curricula. A recurring theme throughout the document is the need for whole school intervention based on whole school data. This document, therefore, proposes several views in relation to violence and bullying which are worthy of consideration for future planning, research and intervention.
Strengths and Limitations of the Research

The research program undertaken for this portfolio has some strong elements including a rich database of both quantitative and qualitative responses from a substantial number of students in a range of secondary school systems. The data collected did reveal relevant and sometimes unexpected results. The survey form yielded information which related to numerous aspects of bullying, but in addition the use of specific demographic descriptors identified the cultural origins of the respondent and was a key element in facilitating cross-cultural comparisons. The data thus acquired has provided the foundation for a range of analyses including cultural differences in girls’ resiliency to bullying and the bullying of Asian students as well as adolescent attitudes. The data was also organised to clearly illustrate perceived safety aspects of the school and environment and this information facilitates detailed and customised school re-organisational strategies to address bullying. Overall the data analyses seemed to strongly validate the whole customised approach. However, the use of a single method of data collection can be problematic. It is recommended that future research also consider other aspects of data such as reports of bullying recorded through school mechanisms for reporting as well as possible outsider or researcher observations in schools. This would provide for shared method variances and add to the overall picture of bullying in the school.

The analysis of the quantitative responses discussed in this document provides only a portion of the full picture of peer abuse occurring. Further examination of the qualitative data would add substantially to the evidence and provide further direction for customised intervention. The research was also limited in that it did not ask for teacher assessments about bullying in the school. Such information would be a highly valuable in providing a secondary source of views and experiences which may well reveal either close correlations to students’ experiences or a completely different view of bullying in the school. Teachers were sometimes mentioned as either bullies or bullied in the written responses of students, and this is an element of the paradigm which needs further exploration to inform intervention.
Educational Implications

There can be no question that the results of this research have strong implications for schools and education generally. Despite a prolonged period of interest in bullying intervention in particular, there is still no definitive and unequivocal pattern of intervention established. While some continued debate is desirable and expected and will undoubtedly lead to further development, it must now be clearly accepted that several elements of intervention are essential to successfully address bullying in schools. These would include, as demonstrated here, a thorough examination of the parameters of bullying in the specific location or school and the need for an informed and committed school community that is prepared to devote adequate time and resources to intervention. This document also proposes that all elements of intervention need to be addressed for a truly comprehensive attempt to overcome a bullying culture embedded in the school ethos. The educational implications are substantial for such a proposal. It is not sufficient to create a written “policy” which condemns bullying if nothing further is attempted; it is not enough to provide students with education about bullying if other members of the school staff and community are not also expected to change their behaviour, and in the view of this researcher it is not enough to hand intervention over to peers if serious bullying is resulting in physical and psychological harm to others. The major educational implication of the approach described here is the comprehensiveness and scope of assessment, intervention and commitment. This cannot always be an adjunctive program. Bullying intervention may well need to take precedence for some time in some locations to re-establish a safe and secure learning environment for all participants. Violence intervention has a somewhat different profile since episodes such as the cross-bow incident in NSW in 2003 are rare, if horrifying, anomalies. They nevertheless require an equally comprehensive examination of the school structure to ensure a safe environment.

Overall, educationally it seems time that what is needed is whole school systems focused on well defined and compulsory restructuring of key protective elements, in contrast to the interventions currently being attempted which are often un-researched. The macro-system approach must provide adequate training and financial and other resources for teachers and students in schools to establish the importance of this issue. Further it seems timely that violence and bullying be
identified as health issues and a proportion of the health budget be allocated to education programs provided widely throughout society in relation to these issues. The use of the media as an educational rather than recording mechanism also needs close examination for future intervention. Finally, with regard to educational implications, the preparation of pre-service teachers in behaviour management and in particular in bullying and violence intervention needs to be a pre-requisite to employment. University teacher preparation programs can no longer ignore the need for greater understanding and skilling in elements of behaviour management. Acceptance of responsibility for adequate protective skills and knowledge must become a formal component of such programs.

**Future Directions for Research and Intervention**

There has been an undeniable element of bullying and violence within schools since education facilities became widely accessible. Progress has been slow in dealing with institutionalised aggression and as Foucault (1977) points out, the use of power and coercion since feudal times has been only marginally civilised in our modern society. What is needed now is longitudinal evidence of what happens to school bullies in their later lives. We need strong research evidence which illustrates the progress from small-time school bully to big-time corporate bully or long term domestic bully in order to justify intensive early intervention in the school years. It is not enough however to imagine that ad hoc programs of education or intervention during schooling will suffice. The problem of bullying will not be addressed until there is a systematic public education program which goes beyond the occasional news story. Governments need to commit to long-term intervention in education and corporations need to commit to substantial training and skilling of management in appropriate non-coercive behaviours.

Future researchers need to consider the concept of the school terrorist given recent horrific school massacres, frequently in the United States but increasingly elsewhere. While it is evident that intrusive interventions such as searching students for weapons and a siege mentality in school environmental structures do little to improve real or imagined security in schools, it may be necessary to consider a combination of education, remediation, therapy and punitive consequences as
incidents of bullying and violence become more serious. Bullying and violence which leads to hospitalisation as a result of physical harm to young people as discussed in this document cannot be dealt with as mildly aberrant or inappropriate behaviour. Such behaviour is criminal and deserves criminal sanctions. Psychological harm which can be traced to deliberate taunting through verbal abuse, text messaging and internet abuse and which has resulted in death from suicide cannot be considered as suitable for treatment under no-blame approaches. Future interventions must address the reality of the seriousness of the consequences of bullying and must act accordingly to ensure justice is done and seen to be done. In short, the continuum of intervention approaches must be extended to include the most destructive extent of the spectrum, and sanctions and programs put in place to ensure changes to students' behaviour before crises arise. Further, the use of a range of methodologies for gathering data should be included in future research as a means of addressing the common issue of single method bias. Future research should be focussed as much on outsider observations and student formal reports through school or other reporting mechanisms, as on questionnaire completion.

Conclusions

Conclusions to be drawn from this body of research and intervention are broad and varied. The focus of the program has been long-term and has spanned a wide range of educational and other institutions. Immersion in the most recent and most influential literature to date provides exposure to an almost overwhelming mix of philosophical, scientific and pedagogical elements relevant to the issues of violence and bullying in schools. There are common elements, nevertheless, which prescribe efficacious intervention. Bullying in schools is currently, and will be for the foreseeable future, a serious and enduring problem; violence in schools is a growing problem which warrants equally serious consideration. Both need to be systematically measured and analysed to establish real levels and impact prior to intervention. Intervention in both violence and bullying in schools should be research based and educationally focussed. Such intervention needs to address all components discussed in this document including broad community and specific teacher education programs, policy development and implementation, organisational restructuring, broad student education programs and individual interventions which
address inadequate and inappropriate behaviours using remediation, education, reinforcement and consequences.

Beyond the school wall, society and in particular institutions and organisations within society must also begin to systematically address issues of bullying and violence using relevant legislative interventions which target these behaviours specifically. This could be similar to legislation which addressed harassment of homosexual individuals and discrimination against women and which was coupled with broad social education programs, which have resulted in improved attitudes and behaviour. Utilisation of current legislative structures can facilitate intervention. The complete eradication of violence and bullying in society and in schools is simply not possible. Nevertheless, a much more focussed and structured approach is now prescribed in view of the research evidence and the availability of appropriate interventions.

Bullying and violence seriously affect a small minority of individuals in society and in schools and exposure alone does not define the impact. Resilience therefore, is a common and essential psychological skill to adopt, exhibit or acquire in order to resist and recover from the experience. Peers can represent a powerful positive element in the phenomena, but can also have a serious negative impact if unsupportive. Therefore Peer Advocacy or similar interventions must be made available to ensure peers accept responsibility for the safety of more vulnerable or unprotected others. We as a community of educators must lead the way in guiding society towards a more protective and responsible, a more involved and committed response to bullied individuals, and a more interventionist, more proactive and stronger response to those who perpetrate aggression towards others.

Summary

Violence and bullying in schools and in society have consumed several years of investigation, research, observation and intervention in the production of this portfolio of work. The focus has ranged widely, but has remained within the confines of a search for answers to the perennial problem of victimised children and young people. The experiences of the death, incarceration and serious injury of students
known to the researcher over the period of the study have served to reinforce some philosophical views and dramatically alter others. In the end, the search is not over, the work is not complete but the contribution is offered for consideration as a beginning to a solution.
APPENDICES FOR CHAPTER 2
Thank you for filling out this survey. Your answers will be reported in such a way that you will not be able to be identified.

1. Year Level

2. Are you (please tick) Male □ Female□

3. What is the:  
   - country of your birth
   - country of your mother’s birth
   - country of your father’s birth

4. Have any of the following behaviours ever happened to you at this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once or more a day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Being teased or called names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Receiving comments about your family, your country of birth or religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Left out of things on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hit, punched or kicked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Forced to give money or belongings to someone without wanting to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Comments on the way you look</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Touched in ways you don’t want to be touched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Personal property eg. bag, locker damaged or disturbed on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Would you describe bullying and harassment at this school as (circle one number)

Not a problem 1 2 3 4 5 6 A major problem

6. a. If a friend told you that they were being bullied or picked on by somebody from this school or a group of others, what would you suggest they do?

b. Would you report it to a teacher  Yes □ No □
If no, why wouldn’t you? ________________________________

______________________________

c. Who gets bullied at this school? ________________________________

______________________________

d. Who is a bully at this school? ________________________________

______________________________

7. Do you think this school helps students feel good about themselves? (Circle one number)

1 2 3 4
Very few feel good
All feel good

8. Are you willing to help somebody you see being bullied?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, how? _______________________________________

If No, why not? _______________________________________

9. Suggest ways we can help stop bullying/harassment in the school.

______________________________

10. Place crosses beside any areas of the school where you think students feel unsafe.
(You may choose one or more boxes)

Classroom ................... ☐ Toilets .................... ☐
Library .................... ☐ Quadrangle .................... ☐
Hall .................... ☐ Playground .................... ☐
Corridors .................... ☐ Basketball Courts .................... ☐
Change rooms ............ ☐ Bus .................... ☐
Walking or travelling to school ............ ☐
Others: ________________________________

Comment on any personal experiences with bullying/harassment at school or on the way to or from school:

______________________________

______________________________
### Frequency Table

#### School Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook High</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2.3 gender of bullied students by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalenanglican</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalenanglican</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>618</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>618</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequencies

#### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school attended</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2.4

### COUNTRY OF BIRTH CATEGORIES AND CODES

Countries named by survey participants as their country of birth or the country of birth of a parent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ASIAN</th>
<th>2. MIDDLE EASTERN</th>
<th>3. EASTERN EUROPEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. EUROPEAN</th>
<th>5. HISPANIC</th>
<th>6. AUSTRALIAN/NEW ZEALAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. PACIFIC ISLANDS</th>
<th>8. AMERICAN/CANADIAN</th>
<th>9. AFRICAN/CARIBBEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel Isles</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. INDIAN</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2.5 Distribution by country of birth for all students in each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>captain cook high</th>
<th>mary immaculate college</th>
<th>magdalena anglican college</th>
<th>st barnabas college</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle eastern</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern european</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>european</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hispanic</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>australia/nz/papua</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new guinea</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pacific islands</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usa/canada</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>african/caribbean</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth of student</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Eastern</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern European</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia/New Guinea</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Islands</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA/Canada</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African/Caribbean</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within country of birth of student</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2.7 Year level totals for all students by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>magdalena anglican</td>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2.8 Year level of bullied students at each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>captain cook high</th>
<th>mary immaculate college</th>
<th>magdalena anglican</th>
<th>st barnabas college</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within YEAR</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2.9a Students bullied by namecalling by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>not bullied</th>
<th>bullied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>namecalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namecalling</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.115**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>namecalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namecalling</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.115**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>namecalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namecalling</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.115**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>not bullied</th>
<th>bullied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within comments</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within comments</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within comments</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td></td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### APPENDIX 2.9c Students bullied by exclusion by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>not bullied</th>
<th>bullied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within exclude</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within exclude</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within exclude</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 2.9d Students bullied by threats by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>not bullied</th>
<th>bullied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within verbal</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within verbal</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within verbal</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Kendall's tau_b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spearman's rho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
### APPENDIX 2.9d Students bullied by threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not bullied</td>
<td>bullied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spearman's rho**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).**
### Physical Students bullied by being hit/punched or kicked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Not bullied</th>
<th>Bullied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within physical</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within physical</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within physical</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.207**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Physical | Pearson Correlation | -0.207**  |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000  |
| N | 614 | 614 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Kendall's tau_b

| Kendall's tau_b | Gender | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000  | -0.207** |
|                 | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000  |
|                 | N | 618 | 614 |

| Physical | Correlation Coefficient | -0.207**  |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000  |
| N | 614 | 614 |

### Spearman's rho

| Spearman's rho | Gender | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000  | -0.207** |
|                | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000  |
|                | N | 618 | 614 |

| Physical | Correlation Coefficient | -0.207**  |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000  |
| N | 614 | 614 |

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
### APPENDIX 2.10a

All students assessment of how serious the problem is by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>mild problem</th>
<th>moderate problem</th>
<th>serious problem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalena anglican</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>serious</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.113**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serious</td>
<td>-.113**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Kendall’s tau_b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.090**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.090**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.102**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>mild problem</th>
<th>moderate problem</th>
<th>serious problem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalen anglican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
# APPENDIX 2.10c

All students willingness to report to a teacher by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>would you report to a teacher?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>depends</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within you would report to a teacher?</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within you would report to a teacher?</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalena anglican</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within you would report to a teacher?</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within you would report to a teacher?</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within you would report to a teacher?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school attended</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.113**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.113**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.090**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.090**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.102**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school attended</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.102**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Depends</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Would You Report to a Teacher?</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Would You Report to a Teacher?</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Would You Report to a Teacher?</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Would You Report to a Teacher?</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Would You Report to a Teacher?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2.10e All students by school: Does school help you feel good about yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>does school help you feel good?</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>very few feel good</th>
<th>some feel good</th>
<th>most feel good</th>
<th>all feel good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalena anglican</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Kendall’s tau_b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Spearman’s rho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>.142**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
## APPENDIX 2.10f

### Ballied students responses by school: does school help you feel good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Very Few Feel Good</th>
<th>Some Feel Good</th>
<th>Most Feel Good</th>
<th>All Feel Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Does School Help You Feel Good</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Does School Help You Feel Good</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Does School Help You Feel Good</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Does School Help You Feel Good</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within School Attended</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Does School Help You Feel Good</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>does school help you feel good about yourself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school attended</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does school help you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.135**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>Would You Help Someone You See</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>maybe/depends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalen college anglican</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>maybe/de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalena anglican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within would you help someone you see being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2.11a Bullied students by school-Feel safe in toilets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in toilets?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>not feel safe</td>
<td>feel safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary immaculate college</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalen anglican</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st barnabas college</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.130**</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.130**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>Kendall's tau_b Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
### Appendix 2.11b Bullied Students by School - Feel Safe in Playground?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School attended</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Feel Safe in Playground</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not feel safe</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feel safe</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within feel safe in playground?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in playground?</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in playground?</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in playground?</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe in playground?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.244 **</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Correlation**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.221 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kendall's tau_b**

**Pearson Correlation**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
<th>school attended</th>
<th>feel safe in playground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.241 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearman's rho**

**Pearson Correlation**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Not Feel Safe</th>
<th>Feel Safe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe on bus?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Immaculate College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe on bus?</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Anglican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe on bus?</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Barnabas College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe on bus?</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within feel safe on bus?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2.11d Bullied students by gender * feel safe on bus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>feel safe on bus?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>not feel safe</td>
<td>feel safe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>feel safe on bus?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
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Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>feel safe on bus?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel safe on bus?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
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Developed over a number of years and recently tested with Australian school personnel, the “Coping with Violence” approach ensures that all members of the school community commit to resolving violence through education.

Coping with violence in Australian schools

Shortcomings in effective data collection, resistance to the documentation of incidents, and unnecessary focus on a small number of serious incidents have contributed to a distorted picture of life in Australian schools. Current media interest, as well as government inquiries, recent funds allocation and discussion at all levels of society, centers on the apparent upsurge of violence, particularly in schools.

More confusion than clarity exists on this issue, and any related discussions should include documented and systematic research. While problems of interpersonal violence within schools are evident, it is nevertheless also apparent that schools function effectively and successfully for the most part.

In examining the issue, it is not appropriate to attribute blame to one group—especially students. All members of the school and wider community must examine their contribution to the problem and take responsibility for prevention. Adults within the school and the community must begin to assume greater responsibility for supervision, support, direction, and management of school-age persons and to indicate through their own behaviors a rejection of violence as a solution to problems.

The “Coping with Violence” approach developed from the fundamental belief that all members of the school community need to make a commitment to nonviolence and that this should be recorded in formal policy, reflected in practice and evidenced through evaluation. A nonviolent philosophy and practice must be accepted by students, parents, teachers, executives and all other contributing community members if a genuine attempt is to be made to cope with violence in school.

Adopting the strategies incorporated into the “Coping with Violence” program reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members and reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale for all. It also demonstrates a willingness to address the unequal power relationships between parties and to ensure that all concerned have their legitimate physical, psychological and emotional needs met in a safe, nurturing and predictable environment.

Information is lacking
Statistical information regarding the incidence of violence in Australian schools is incomplete, fragmented and scant. Nevertheless, it seems, on the surface, to indicate an increased involvement of students in violent incidents.

An Australian Institute of Criminology report asserts that only .04 percent of students are ever involved in violent incidents. The number of recorded offenses in New South Wales (NSW), however, increased 71.5 percent between 1986 and 1992, according to the Australian Board of Statistics.

A paper issued by the NSW Legislative Council reported that, during the first half of 1993, 59 incidents of school violence occurred. However, teachers in Western Sydney, when consulted about this figure, enquired, “which school and on which day reported the 59 incidents?” — evidently a major indication of underreporting.

This problem is acknowledged both in Australia and overseas. For example, in the United States, the fact that two-thirds of all school crime is not officially reported was first established in the 1978 Violent Schools — Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to Congress. The lack of reporting is attributed mainly to the negative publicity such reporting brings and the consequent loss of school status, students and staff that follows.

It is clear that some decision must be made at the macro-system level to protect and support schools that report violent incidents. An efficient, confidential and cumulative mechanism needs to be established to facilitate research into the problem.

At present the statistics that are recorded in New South Wales are inflated...
because all incidents on school grounds are included, not just those involving school students or those occurring during school hours. The information is an inaccurate reflection of the true incidence of what could reasonably be termed “violence in schools.”

Violence in schools defined
Some definition of the term needs to be stated. For the purpose of determining the severity of the problem of violence in schools the definition should confine itself to these parameters:

Violence in schools refers to violent, assaultive or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or school community members with each other, or with school property, which occurs within normally accepted school hours and within normally accepted school boundaries and situations.

The Australian Teachers Union suggests a similar definition:

Violence in schools is present in any situation where a member of the school community (teacher, student, other education worker, parent, or visitor) is intimidated, abused, threatened, or assaulted or their property deliberately damaged by another member of that community or the public in circumstances arising out of their activities in a school.

If these definitions were used, it could be readily shown that the level and incidence of violence in schools is remarkably low.

This definition specifically excludes acts of violence that occur outside the normally accepted bounds, situations and times or that represent acts perpetrated against the school by persons outside of the school community. In particular, it cannot be argued that community-based gangs who enter school premises during or after school hours to engage in acts of violence or vandalism should be represented in the statistics or definition of “school violence.”

This type of violence has its origins in the community and is a community responsibility — schools are merely the victims. Just as domestic violence would not include intruders who entered a home to commit acts of violence, so this definition confines itself specifically to the interactions between school members, in the school environment, during school hours.

Examining the school’s responsibility
Schools need to delineate categorically the parameters of their responsibility. Media reports that refer to “schoolboy crimes” often fail to clarify whether in fact the crime occurred within school hours, schools grounds or during school-based supervision. Indeed, the reference to “school” in many reports merely reflects the child’s age (which will obviously be “school-age”), and it is somewhat misleading of the media to continue to insinuate that all criminal or violent acts perpetrated by children are in some way linked to school. Their after-hours misdemeanors have little or nothing to do with the function of the school.

It would seem appropriate for schools to determine the extent of their supervisory responsibilities and to state these. For example, travel by public transport to and from school may not be viewed as requiring school supervision. Gang conflicts outside school grounds, even between students of the school, are probably beyond the jurisdiction of school authority. Certainly acts of violence or criminal behavior engaged in after school hours, even if students are still in school uniform, are probably the responsibility of the community, not the school.

Since a good deal of confusion seems to exist in this regard, it is important to record the agreed parameters for public scrutiny.

Further, some examination of the corporate culture of schools is likely to reveal policy and processes which, in certain circumstances, reinforce and maintain violent interaction patterns. A belief that older students require less supervision may be unfounded, since students engage in violent behavior during unsupervised periods.

Some examination of the corporate culture of schools is likely to reveal policy and processes which, in certain circumstances, reinforce and maintain violent interaction patterns ... Teachers whose preferred management style is authoritarian, hostile or excessively punitive are likely to escalate rather than defuse potential violent situations.

Teachers whose preferred management style is authoritarian, hostile or excessively punitive are likely to escalate rather than defuse potentially violent situations. It is also possible that the image of female teachers as subordinates to male executives, vulnerable and dependent on supportive intervention, is maintained through school structures. Female teachers, in particular, need to be seen as effectively managing behavior and demanding appropriate responses from students if sexual victimization is to be halted.

Nonviolent response options
In determining an appropriate response to the management of violence in schools, a multifaceted and comprehensive approach is desirable. The “Coping with Violence” workshops presented over the past few years by J. Jenkin and V. Bowie represent an amalgamation of educative theory and practice with social welfare concepts. The approach involves all members of the school community and is thoroughly described in the soon-to-be published text, Resolving Violence Through Education -- A Handbook for
SCHOOLS.

The "Coping with Violence in Schools" approach comprises four parts, each of which represents a comprehensive methodology for informing and training participants in nonviolent response options and attitude development. The four parts include:

Part A Strategies for school personnel
Part B Structuring a policy for a non-violent school
Part C Resolve 1 — Anti-violence curriculum for primary and secondary students
Part D Intervention for identified or potentially violent students

In Part A, all professional members of the school, including teachers, executives, administrators, assistants and support personnel, receive thorough in-service training that examines the school's responsive and preventative readiness. Participants develop individual skills and strategies while contributing to the overall corporate structure or restructure.

This part of the program comprises several modules that are delivered over 12 hours of in-service instruction. Modules cover perceptions and origins of violence with background information related to statistics as well as intervention strategies at the organizational and inter-personal levels. A comprehensive needs analysis is incorporated to facilitate the mobilization of resources and efforts in the areas of greatest need within the particular school.

In Part B of the program, all members of the school community, including parents and students, are involved in the development of an active policy of non-violence. This is in contrast to the passive model, which sees policy measured in length of pages. The active policy approach incorporates evaluation measures that reflect changes in the day-to-day conduct of school members at all levels.

In particular, Part B addresses key considerations related to:

- the philosophical aims and mission of the policy,
- the recruitment, training and support of appropriate personnel;
- development of relevant and specific programs, including curricular, responsive and preventative programs;
- an examination of organization structures as they impact implementation, monitoring and review of the processes used; and
- a discussion of resources acquisition and deployment.

In Part C, the Resolve Curriculum (Resolving Violence through Education) is introduced as a generic program of information and skills for coping with violence, applicable to primary and secondary students. The curriculum has been specifically designed to address gender differences in the experience of violence, an area that has been ignored or neglected in previous curricula, particularly those developed overseas. The format for presentation follows a partially segregated delivery mode, with several modules presented to integrated groups of males and females and other modules presented to segregated groups.

Part D has been specifically devised to assist students who already manifest violent behaviors or who are identified as potentially violent. The focus of this part of the approach is to develop individualized academic, behavioral and social-skills programs through the systematic application of resolution strategies and instructional goals.

Two main features of this part are the Resolve II curriculum and the Suspension Support methodology. Students who qualify for inclusion in this part manifest behaviors that place them at risk of suspension and often-repeated suspension. The methodologies acknowledge that students need instruction to facilitate the development of a more appropriate repertoire of behaviors.

A thorough program of intervention for pre-suspension, in-school suspension and support during out-of-school suspension is also needed in order to reflect a remedial rather than punitive orientation to the procedure. The curriculum offers individuals the opportunity to discuss behaviors which may be the triggers to trouble in the classroom and instruct these persons in goal setting and self-monitoring. An improved prognosis for success in school is anticipated if the students' attempts to reform are acknowledged by teachers and some re-examination of teacher responses are undertaken.

Responding to violence: teacher's role

Fundamental to the implementation of this approach is an acceptance by teachers and school administrators that responding to violence is part of the role of the teacher. Many teachers do not accept behavior management and program development as part of their responsibility; rather, they view the development of appropriate behaviors as a family responsibility. As long as this view prevails, major and increasing problems of violence in schools will continue.

While the impact of home and family life, as well as media and peer influences, cannot be ignored, teachers cannot renego their responsibility to teach children how to behave in school. It is pointless to attempt to deliver well-planned content lessons to students who do not possess the most basic skills that will equip them for learning — attending, accepting and responding in class.

Endnotes

5. "Youth Violence."

For more information about the Resolving Violence Through Education — A Handbook for Schools or the "Coping with Violence" workshops conducted by J. Jenkin and V. Bowie, write Jean B. Jenkin, Faculty of Education, University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, P.O. Box 555, Campbelltown NSW 2560, Australia.
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ABSTRACT

This paper represents an attempt to begin to formulate an underlying philosophy for violence intervention programmes with an educational focus. A range of international perspectives, approaches and solutions which have been implemented here and overseas, are examined to identify the emphasis and impact of key factors in violence as it is manifest in society. There can be no doubt the major factor in all violence statistics is gender—indeed there must be an acknowledgment of the gender differential in terms of experiences and participation, if any progress is to be made in reducing violence in society. It is important therefore that educational programs which are offered across a wide range of social institutions should recognise and address this issue. Both psychological and sociological factors also need to be considered in any discussion of the origins of violence but the view is expressed in this paper that individual responsibility and skill development is the major strategy for developing non-or anti-violent orientations. While the broadest meaning of the term ‘education’ is used in the discussion, it will provide a foundation for teachers and others to consider their motives in selecting and implementing such programs and will encourage reflection on the parameters of their capacity to intervene in violence.
RESOLVING VIOLENCE THROUGH EDUCATION

JEAN B. JENKIN, JUNE 1995

VIOLENCE AND EDUCATION

Placing violence in the context of education seems, at first, to be a contradictory notion. Traditionally education, educators, students and places of learning have been viewed with a measure of security as 'safe and happy' concepts, notwithstanding the equally familiar tradition of the school bully. It is reassuring to know that schools are still safe havens in an increasingly pressured society and yet in recent times a mutual metamorphosis has been evident as these previously polarised concepts are more often discussed in the same context. The merge is an awkward one. Violence is being seen as a component of education and education has begun to noticeably extend its parameters to include education for violence—for its proponents, its victims and the community in general.

That violence can be resolved through education is an attractive philosophical proposition. It empowers us to shape environments to prevent destructive acts and to mould individuals so that their self-control guarantees our safety. If the generational nature of violence—the destructive masculinity, the distorted power, can all be accounted for in 'education'—if violence is indeed a learned behaviour (Sutherland 1947, Akers 1973, Kavanagh and Hops 1994)—we should be able to empirically demonstrate that and develop wide-ranging programs that will make a difference. If, however, we ignore the data or avoid gathering damning evidence, then much of the anti-violence and violence prevention work currently developing, will be fruitless. Internationally, a plethora of approaches, programs and curricula have been developed with millions of dollars in training hours and personnel already invested in responding to, and preventing violence. It is somewhat of a concern therefore, that little impact is evident, and it is clear that more carefully focussed research needs to be devised and that research already undertaken needs to be more carefully analysed (for example Lefkowitz et al 1972). In this way, a sound theoretical foundation recognising the major contributing factors can be established.

There are key factors which need to be considered in any intervention which attempts to teach the resolution of violence through education. These factors must be addressed as their impact prescribes outcomes and they include gender as the key factor (Egger 1994, Scutt 1995, Wallace 1994) coupled with individual psychology and then sociological influences (Patterson 1985). If we can answer the key questions—why is violence so predominantly a masculine phenomenon? what psychological processes provide the impetus for violence against others? what sociological factors contribute?—then we may be able to create the ultimate program to intervene. Certainly some current programs attempt to address some of these issues, few acknowledge gender as a key however.
GENDER - THE KEY FACTOR

There can be no doubt that any discussion of violence in terms of education for violence prevention must acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that gender is central. It is not enough to discuss the presence of violence in our society when the topography of such violence clearly indicates that males and females have quite different experiences and involvement; it is nonsense to talk about ‘violent people’ when we should be discussing for the most part, violent males. Violence is most often a result of a conflict in which a violent male chooses to have his needs met by physically damaging means, and the statistics demonstrate that maleness is a correlational and contributing factor - if not ‘causal’ (Egger 1995) in 80-85% of homicides, (Wallace A 1986) 90% of assaults, (Salmelainen and Coumelaros 1993) and virtually all sexual offences. Often a range of sociological factors are used to excuse or to justify or blame for their decision. Why some males choose to opt for violence in preference to more peaceful solutions has been variously addressed in the literature as reflecting everything from biological determinism - ‘that’s just the way men are’ - (Wallace S, 1994), to mythology - he didn’t do it’ - (Scully D 1987), and feminist interpretations do not provide completely satisfactory answers. The statistics do not tell us that all men are violent, but they do tell us that of all the people in society who are violent, the overwhelming majority are male. Non-violent men therefore, will be the most powerful advocates for non-violence in any educational program or anti-violence intervention but until non-violent males accept the gender differential, demand to be seen as non-violent first and male second, the defensiveness regarding this issue will continue to impede progress in resolving it. Maleness itself is probably not ‘causal’ as some have suggested, but the social and situational forces which combine with masculinity may be. Educational settings can provide the neutral territory for discussion of gender issues, and interventions such as the ResolVIE curriculum (Jenkin 1993) which is delivered in both joint and segregated sessions have been shown to encourage discussion amongst and between student groups of both sexes.
It is imperative that we involve ourselves in early intervention, in systematic training, in remedial response initiatives that recognise that anti-social behaviours in individuals indicate a need for re-education and addressing both the psychological and sociological contributing factors. Our brief is to target, in particular violent masculine beliefs, expressed by many in a social context but acted upon by a violent few, and replace them with attitudes and behaviours which are not pro-violence. The term re-education is appropriate here because there has often been a systematic and thorough training in violence in the life experiences of violent individuals (Spatz-Widom 1993, ). At various stages of moral and cognitive development there is a readiness, a receptivity for ‘education’, particularly in the early years. Learning experiences may be planned or spontaneous, but the determining factor in terms of their impact is the receptivity of the individual. When negative and anti-social experiences are more readily available at these crucial moments of receptivity, learning nevertheless takes place. Further, anti-social behaviours are often much easier to adopt than pro-social behaviours—the rewards are often immediate, the consequences negligible. Why ‘waste time’ negotiating and using conflict resolution when a quick shove or kick, a well-placed thump will deliver the goods without delay?

The individual psychology perspective of violence asserts that, in the end, violence is an individual choice, irrespective of the cultural milieu, the family or the circumstances of the conflict. The message here is not that we should or must strive for a completely violence-free world. Violence is part of the human condition. The message is that an education about violence is needed—we need to know and accept the facts because only then can we effect them. Most of all, though we need to know how to manage and re-direct the violent impulses inherent in all humanity. We can all only do our best to resist such urges. So it is not those of us who struggle to remain in control that are the main targets of intervention programs, rather it is those who see no reason to maintain control, who enjoy the rage and the power of assault, and who prefer to use violent urges and capacities to their own advantage. These are the main targets educational interventions must reach.

Education has become a much more complex endeavour in recent years as teachers are given greater responsibility for imparting specialised knowledge and developing technical skills to ensure the employability of future generations. It has become increasingly apparent, however, that such knowledge and skills will only partially equip these young people for life. It is also essential that they be assisted in developing survival and coping skills and in acquiring appropriate interpersonal skills if they are to have a successful future. Such curricula need to be incorporated into the formal program and assigned a level of importance corresponding to their impact. Systematic attention needs to be paid to those who do not demonstrate such skills, to broadening the response repertoire young people have to draw on in difficult situations, and to reinforcing non-violent attitudes. Such important dimensions of relationship cannot be left to chance.
Further, it is clear that the many influences on young people to accept violence, to endorse its use and to vicariously enjoy its portrayal, need to be challenged. We need to equip young people with factual information and an opportunity to discuss and reject commonsense beliefs and attitudes about the role and function of violence in our society. They should be challenged to examine their own beliefs and attitudes in the light of information they may not previously have known. Education programs which focus specifically on violence intervention ought to be able to do this and if carefully developed will provide successive generations with the foundation they need to work towards a safer and less-violent society. The common denominator which is manageable and predictable in the lives of all persons including the most violent is that at some point they all attend school—however briefly and however unsuccessfully that may be for some. We cannot ignore, while being cognisant of our own parameters and limitations, the enormous potential education has for assisting individuals to develop legitimate beliefs and behaviours which reject violence and permit a more positive prognosis for social competence.

We can resolve violence through education in the early and preventative stages by attending to the behaviours of identified young children—particularly boys—by offering education and support to families and by maintaining supporting communities. We can resolve violence through education at later stages by implementing remedial programs instead of merely punitive, in both educational and judicial settings.

CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON VIOLENCE INTERVENTION

When violence intervention, prevention and education programs are discussed, there is a tendency by professional educators to assume that the responsibility for implementation is seen to rest with them, and this is indeed a daunting prospect. However, currently, particularly in the United States, most societal institutions and professions can demonstrate their commitment to dealing with the violence that affects their field through specific programmes. This augers well for the essential multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary model necessary to address violence issues in all areas of social functioning. The development of anti-violence coalitions comprising representatives from a range of organisations already attempting to address the issues will be a key factor in primary prevention. The programs and perspectives will be discussed under four broad headings:

1. Medical and health-related perspectives and interventions
2. Judicial perspectives and interventions
3. Educational perspectives and interventions
4. Community perspectives and interventions

This approach is taken to offer a broad and comprehensive analysis of the concept of resolving violence through education. Teachers may feel relieved and confident that the full burden of responsibility is not with them to address violence issues in the isolation of the classroom. In the field of education for violence prevention, the formal education settings do have a unique responsibility and impact since they are required to work with all members of the community—whether violent or not, while other social institutions are often engaged in responsive programs which deal with identified violent persons only. Obviously, the resources and training as well as the legislative supports which accompany such interventions are an advantage. Nevertheless, teachers in schools can also develop a comprehensive approach to the issue, as will be discussed further.
1. Medical and Health Perspectives.

It has become fashionable of late to refer to the incidence and prevalence of violence in society as 'epidemic', an emotive term used to effect in particular by politicians eager to be seen as concerned for stopping the 'epidemic' and returning their communities presumably to a 'normal' state. Unfortunately, there are several connotations and meanings of this term which make it the least appropriate analogy to use as a basis for theory or intervention relating to violence. By its very nature, an epidemic has only temporary prevalence, the onset is often sudden and the aetiology transient. Epidemics are seen to 'sweep across' communities having intense effects over a short period of time until the source is isolated, a successful treatment developed and applied, and a return to 'normalcy' achieved as soon as possible. In applying this analogy to violence we are likely to lose sight of the most obvious fact that this 'condition' has been long-standing, continuously manifested and permanently prevalent since recorded time! In using the notion of epidemicity we are likely to ignore the endemic nature of violence. We may be inclined to mobilise resources and interventions for short-term, intensive management instead of making a commitment to long-term revolutionary change. The term also implies an innocent involvement in the problem—one not chosen but forced upon or visited upon the poor victim, and while this is true of the recipients of the violent act, it certainly is not true of the offenders. Germ warfare may be closer to the truth—a deliberate and calculated attempt to exert power, not an accidental or unmanageable invasion by some virulent or hostile force. We must take care not to use language that implies that a dose of sympathy, some immediate restorative medication and a comfortable recuperation period will help us deal with this 'epidemic' as we do with other diseases. Violent offenders choose to participate in violence and must therefore not be seen as innocent victims of circumstance or chance, but as competent individuals whose choices prescribe their future just as they do for all of us. The concept of rehabilitation is often applied in this context—the term suggests a return to a more acceptable and usual state, a recovery from a temporary period of dysfunction. Violent individuals, however, have often never been functional in the social sense so the task would be to establish patterns of interaction which would fall more closely within acceptable social bounds.

The term 'epidemic' nevertheless also suggests several medical responses which may be applicable to successful intervention in violence. Identification, isolation and destruction of the source may be a most appropriate response if we assume that the source is psychological not human. By isolating the psychological sources of the violence and identifying the psychological excuses the offender uses to inform and excuse his behaviour it may be possible to destroy the inappropriate thoughts and behaviours and replace them with some that are healthier and more socially legitimate. Long-term In this regard, as with epidemics of disease there would be a responsibility on the part of the practitioner to ensure that those people who are treated can be shown to have overcome the disorder before being permitted to re-enter society. If there are extraneous effects in the social milieu of the individual these must also be addressed and changed to ensure that old patterns of reinforcement or 'infection' are not re-established.
Individual treatment plans must be created and thorough documentation maintained, as with the intervention in disease. One further analogy applies - identification of 'carriers' of the disorder, who may have no current manifestation of symptoms - can and should we attempt to locate and treat such people? Can we diagnose the potential for violent behaviour having examined the social, psychological and historical indicators, and can we base treatment plans on such a methodology?

The 'public health model' for violence intervention has also been discussed (Prothrow-Stith D. 1984) in the context of health education designed to change attitudes and behaviour. She describes the success of other public health programs in reducing smoking, raising awareness of domestic violence and heart disease among other social health issues and suggests that the success of such educational promotions can be duplicated if the media, schools and hospitals contribute time and resources. She has also developed an intervention as a result of her personal experience with injured gang members in her work at the Massachusetts General Hospital. She became dissatisfied with the reactive and clinical approaches medical staff felt obliged to adopt as they patched up the physical evidence of gang disputes, and developed the 'Violence Prevention' curriculum (op cit). The curriculum was offered within the hospital setting to patients recuperating from surgery, and attempted to have them examine their commitment to the gang lifestyle and change their attitudes towards gang membership. Her research indicates that at least in terms of knowledge about violence, there have been gains for participants.

The Sheppard Pratt Hospital in Maryland offers training to Masters degree level in mediation and conflict resolution as a means of addressing violence as a health issue. Violence in relation to gangs is yet to be identified as a major public health issue in Australia, and there is yet to be a comprehensive study done to place gang-related injuries in the general context of health problems. Nevertheless, it may be an appropriate time to consider the future implications of this social phenomenon.

The essentially adversarial perspective endorsed by the criminal justice community represents a distinctly ‘black and white’ notion of violence—there is a victim, there is a perpetrator and the favoured outcome is to apportion blame, guilt and punishment—preferably (but not always) to the violent party. This model is unable to consider the interpersonal and individual psychology aspects of conflict which lead to violence but attempts to apply rigidly defined criteria which may or may not lead to a just outcome. The public nature of violence intervention using judicial procedures is a valued and desired outcome for families of victims and the community—we generally like to see the ‘bad guy’ get his comeuppance! Consider, however, the changing face of the judicial system which is concurrently privatising and making more public the processes of law, and how these changes impact upon outcomes.

With regard to privatising justice Braithwaite (1993) describes the process of ‘-integrative shaming’. He believes that ‘shaming is more important to the control of crime than punishment, and the most potent shaming is that which occurs within communities of concern’ (op cit page 225). The process he describes is one whereby the alleged perpetrator meets privately with the victim, family members and concerned others—within the support of his own concerned community and family members—and a private arrangement is made to determine compensation or restitution. This process, in part concerns itself with the personal development of the offender (i.e., coming to know shame for his act) but research indicates that levels of satisfaction with outcomes are much higher for the offender (85%) than for the victim (51%) (Maxwell and Morris 1993). In terms of educational applications some investigations show that first and minor offenders recover and re-offending is negligible ( ), however there is the concern that such private approaches to conflict management and resolution may mean that justice is neither done nor seen to be done. Some offenders are not capable of feeling shame, guilt or empathy and this process may mean they are not required to submit to adequate consequences for their actions. Schools that adopt conflict resolution and mediation strategies which involve victim, offender and peers or staff in private consultations to resolve conflict may need to exercise caution in the types of offences which are dealt with using the process. It has been used only infrequently with offenders involved in violent offences such as armed robbery, sexual assault and drink driving, with mixed responses from participants regarding the resolution of guilt and anger (Umbreit 1986).

Regarding public judicial processes, which should have the effect of instilling community confidence in the law and its application, what better example could be seen than the current trial of Mr. ‘O.J. Simpson’ in California, U.S.A.? This public prosecution of a very charismatic and wealthy alleged double murderer has been conducted so publicly that it has been very difficult to maintain focus on the crime, due largely to the huge public interest in, and scrutiny of, distracting issues such as the marriage and child-care arrangements of the prosecutor, the television career of a defence attorney’s daughter and the alleged athletic prowess of the accused. Such public means of addressing accusations of violence in the school setting can also backfire when charismatic offenders, often with a large following of admiring peers, seem to enjoy the public castigation of their behaviour, particularly when it results in suspension from educational responsibility for a period. Within the formal educational setting the merely punitive approach is less likely to be successful than one comprising both remedial and punitive components (Jenkin 1993).
Harvard Law School has developed an intervention based on the negotiation skills utilised in high level international arms and trade deals. The "Harvard Negotiation Project" attempts to introduce young people to these skills as a means of resolving neighbourhood and personal disputes and as an alternative to violence (Tullimello 1995). This extends the parameters of legal practitioners into the preventative and pastoral area as a means of resolving violence through education before judicial intervention. In Australia, educational programs devised to introduce skills for developing personal responsibility for behavioural choices, and for introducing violence awareness content into the mainstream program have been initiated in several detention and correctional services locations (Jenkin 1994, Jenkin 1993). This represents a shift in thinking in such institutions where punishment for crimes was usually not paired with an educational program specifically devised to re-educate the offender about his crime.

Other approaches within the judicial system which have been proposed and trialed in an effort to deal with violent offenders include 'boot camps', wilderness programs, police-citizen coalitions which provide activities and support for youth at risk, such as the Los Angeles Police Department Jeopardy Team (Margolis 1991), and gang intervention initiatives. A thorough investigation of the impact, outcomes and processes of these programs will determine long-term effectiveness.

3. EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND INTERVENTIONS

Resolving violence through education as a focus of programs in school settings involves several categories of intervention:

1. A comprehensive approach to managing school-based violence
2. Bullying in schools
3. Addressing community violence through education programs delivered in schools.

Following is a discussion of these separate concerns and a review of current responses.

1. A comprehensive approach to managing school violence

A recent inquiry into school violence (Federal Parliamentary Inquiry 1994) records a range of views relating to the prevalence, impact and nature of school violence. It elicited some remarkable findings particularly in reference to perceived rates of violence, teacher responses and the topography of violence as it is manifest in schools. Although there has been a perception in the media that gratuitous violence was on the increase and that teachers and students were at daily risk of being physically and verbally assaulted, it became apparent during the inquiry that at least some of the concerns being expressed could have been dealt with through competent training in behaviour management at the pre-service level. It was stated in several submissions that universities did not feel it was part of their role to provide this type of preparation for teachers (op cit page 44-46), and teacher unions commented that they felt there was an under-emphasis on discipline and behaviour management in pre-service courses. When devising a comprehensive approach to the management of school violence therefore, it is imperative that this aspect be given priority.
The formulation of the comprehensive approach has been discussed and presented before (Jenkin 1993, 1994) and is recorded here for review:

Components of the Comprehensive Approach to Managing School Violence

PART A. Strategies and skills for school personnel

PART B. Whole school policy development

PART C. Anti-violence curricula for all students (ResolVE 1 - Jenkin 1993)

PART D. Individual interventions for potentially or identified violent students (ResolVE 2 - Jenkin 1994)

Statistical information regarding violence in schools was published in 1992 (Schools Australia) and seemed to indicate an increased incidence. However, the results were inflated due to the custom of recording all incidents that occurred on school premises irrespective of whether the incident involved school students, staff, or other relevant personnel, or whether the incident occurred during school hours. This obviously does not give an accurate reflection of the true incidence for the purpose of determining the severity of the problem of school violence. It is suggested, therefore, that a definition which clarifies the parameters is warranted, and the following definition was submitted to, and accepted by, the inquiry:

'Violence in schools refers to violent, assaultive or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or other school community members with each other, or with school property, and which occurs within normally accepted school boundaries and situations' (Jenkin 1993)

The definition specifically excludes acts of violence which occurred outside the normally accepted bounds, situations, and times of what can reasonably be termed school attendance or operation. It has become necessary to restrict the definition to these terms of reference because of media reports and community views which indicate that teachers and schools are seen as responsible for acts perpetrated by students at times when the students are not part of the school community. (For example on the weekend at recreational venues or in the neighbourhood.) Several newspaper reports have referred to 'school-boy crime' when the only connection between the school and offender is that he is of course of school age at the time of the offence. It would seem appropriate for schools to examine the extent of their supervisory responsibilities and to state categorically their agreed parameters. For example, travel by public transport to and from school may not be viewed as a school responsibility in terms of supervision. Any violent or criminal offence occurring during such a journey would need to be treated as a community responsibility. Further, the definition does not include acts of violence perpetrated against the school by persons outside the school community, such as community based gangs who enter school premises during or outside school hours. This type of violence has its origins in the community as a community responsibility. Schools are merely the victims in this case. Just as home invasions cannot be included in the statistics for domestic violence simply because the offence occurs within the home, so community based crime which effects school must be addressed as a community concern.
11. Bullying in schools.

In Australia and overseas there has been an upsurge of interest in the phenomenon of bullying in schools. Although we do not seem to have, as yet, recorded any suicides as a result of continued bullying and harassment, Japan, U.K., U.S.A. and Europe have all lost school children because they could no longer bear the loneliness and isolation of being the victim of a bully (Byrne 1993, Tattum 1993). In the context of this paper, it is relevant to discuss the relationship between violence and bullying, and explore the perspectives currently being developed to analyse and address the behaviour.

Psychological and physical characteristics of bullies and victims have been scrutinised to establish predictable profiles for effective intervention. Contradictory findings have resulted from research into the physical features of those children who are reportedly victimised, with much evidence nevertheless supporting the stereotype of the physically 'weak' or incompetent individual being the usual target. Even in the early years of childhood differences in behaviour can be identified (Randall 1991, Patterson et al 1987). Children as young as three will surrender a toy on demand to a more assertive child (Manning and Sluckin 1984), and children who have a different appearance (due to ethnicity, disability or fashion) are singled out for adverse attention (Randall ibid). Data relating to the physical weakness of victims also shows that such victims, particularly if male, are rated as unpopular by peers (Besag 1989, Lagerspetz 1982, Lowenstein 1978, Olweus 1993). This could be an argument for boxing and weight-training as is popularly expressed, but should be a clear indicator for re-education of young males in their concepts of strength and masculinity. It is equally clear that such characteristics can be used merely as excuses for the bully to ply his sport and should not be used as a starting point for intervention. What is needed here is a strengthening of the moral and social capacities of the individual.

Two particular theories need brief consideration before we proceed. The first is a notion currently being explored and indeed promoted—of the 'provocative victim' (Besag 1989, Slee and Rigby 1994). The theory suggests that some victims virtually 'ask for it' by means of their own irritating and aggressive behaviour, however to place such a person in the same category as the one who is totally innocent and deliberately selected for the bullying game is to misinterpret the interaction. Victims who have reached a stage in their development of assertive behaviour to the point where they will give as good as they get are playing an entirely different game. Reciprocity is not characteristic of the bully-victim situation, but reflects a dubious partnership in troublemaking. Pikas has described a theoretical approach which examines the supporting community of the bully, which he calls the 'method of common concern' (Pikas 1994), and which seems to echo some of the same characteristics as the shaming theory proposed by Braithwaite (with Daly K 1993). It generally involves a very sensible and readily implemented approach in which members of the community of the bully and victim engage in therapeutic and remedial discussions regarding the offending behaviour.
BULLYBUSTERS (Jenkin 1995) is a comprehensive program being developed to assist teachers and parents to deal with bullying in a systematic way. Others have initiated programs which concentrate on a whole school approach (Tatum 1994) or individual therapy for victims (Byrne 1992) or bullies (Olweus 1989, Pikas 1994). Whatever the ultimate methodology used to address the problem, it is clear that children who were previously incapable of resisting bullies may now be able to acquire coping skills, and bullies whose entertainment was to terrorise their schoolmates may now have to take up football instead! Schools will no longer tolerate or ignore the awful consequences of such behaviour.

III. Addressing community violence through programs offered in schools.

The underlying philosophy of this approach is that non- and anti-violent attitudes and behaviours can be taught and reinforced through student participation in programs which specifically examine the factual information about violence. Additionally, programs which attempt to skill students in interpersonal interactions for conflict management, mediation, negotiation and dispute resolution are also popular. Given an overview of what we are trying to do in this regard, it behoves us to consider the real (that is empirically supported) impact of such programs in terms of changed behaviour and attitudes. Considering the range of strategies currently being adopted, it is also important to ensure generalisation training for acquisition, as some fragmentation could occur for students who have been given training in a range of alternative dispute resolution strategies. In some cases, young people who have been exposed to a variety of possible skills nevertheless resort, in a conflict situation, to the one method they know will have results—usually a violent intervention. Why? Because they have not really had the opportunity to internalise and practice the new skills until they replace the old. This is a challenge for program designers.

Most recently, it has been proposed that young people with difficulties related to interpersonal relationships may benefit from such interventions as anger management, empathy training and social skills programs. These programs offer a systematic appraisal of their current level of functioning, often, and provide a series of progressive lessons which gradually increase the expectations for success and responsibility (see Goldstein A 1993). While it is no doubt useful to assist impulsive youth to develop these skills we should not lose sight of the fact that much violence in our society is not necessarily the result of an angry conflict—rape is not done in anger, children are sexually abused in a systematic and organised fashion, gang beatings are planned and often cold-bloodedly carried out. It will also be important therefore to make this information known to young people if anti-violence curricula or programs are to be adopted.

Gang interventions are a popular means of attempting to divert vulnerable young people from an expectation of life on the street engaged in inter-gang rivalry which has ancient and sometimes forgotten roots. In the USA especially, the intergenerational nature of gang membership means that children are inducted into the gang lifestyle by older family members. They have no other options for achieving goods and activities that will bring recognition. And believe, that their loyalties lay with the social group we describe as a gang. We do not, as yet, in Australia have a problem anywhere approaching that of overseas countries. However, education provided in schools to teach the processes and consequences of induction into a gang is likely to be a deterrent if discussed at the appropriate age level, probably in the primary years.
The Paramount Plan (Ostos T. 1992) is one such program taught in the depressed suburbs of Los Angeles where Latino-Americans congregate and promote and recruit for gangs amongst the elementary school population. In the classrooms in which the program designer teaches, children as young as nine years can give detailed accounts of gang conflicts in which they have lost a family member or witnessed a killing. Similarly in San Francisco, school children can advise you where to obtain guns and ammunition - commodities which are available in department stores to children. A gang intervention program being conducted here is led by a young reformed gang member now confined to a wheelchair life as a result of a gunshot wound. The paediatrician who treated him is also a member of this anti-gang program. (Contra Costa County Teens on Target project).

Fundamentally, the curricula offered and developed in our schools need to meet local needs and be focussed on local phenomena. However, if we only concentrate on current needs we may very well find that we will not be prepared if or when cultural influences create challenges we do not currently anticipate. It may be that a whole range of programs need to be developed and offered as informative and instructive rather than remedial or reforming - it would obviously be much better for our young people if the approach taken is preventative.

4. COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES AND INTERVENTIONS

Within the broader Australian community a number of responses have been initiated which attempt to address either the incidence of violence or what are seen to be 'causes'. These approaches have often evolved out of individual concerns for the decaying moral fabric of Australian society and are legitimised by representation from groups of concerned citizens determined to restore or re-establish the safe communities they knew before. It is difficult to empirically support the impressions that are obviously held by community members - the homicide rate in Australia has remained virtually static for the whole of this century - but the efforts being made are diverse and sincere and evidently offer some means for the general populous to voice their commitment to promoting a non-violent society. The emphasis is quite different in the community based interventions, in that they generally concentrate on making changes to the environment, to legislation or to services rather than attempting to change individuals, which is the main focus of education programs offered in the formal school setting. There is more often a punitive emphasis as a result of this with dire consequences suggested for non-compliance. It is a little unfortunate that those of us who prefer to use an educative approach that requires change and control to emanate from the individual, rather than as a result of state laws and sanctions are often referred to as 'do-gooders' who are too soft on the offenders! In fact, there is room for both approaches to work - and until deviant individuals learn the self-control we expect upright citizens to display, it is possibly quite important that sanctions are available.

Included in the less formal groups recently established is the group 'Listen to the music of your children', established to monitor the lyrics of popular songs and to lobby for censorship of the more graphic examples. While the hard research evidence linking the allegedly discriminatory and provocative lyrics to actual violence has yet to be conducted, the general feeling that these songs contribute nothing to the quality of life or education of young people has been accepted and some politicians are currently agitating for more stringent censorship and controls. Another project resulting from the death of a young man working at his part-time job in a local Pizza Hut is a community pledge to reject violence called 'Enough is Enough' - conducted with great sincerity by the father of the young man.
Local government initiatives to manage disruptive and violent behaviours within the community are becoming more common and focus on such issues as monitoring licensed premises, conducting safety audits and developing community safety coalitions comprised of members of diverse community support agencies (Jenkin 1995). In South Australia, an exemplary project conducted among the seedier areas of the city, where hoteliers generally felt that brawls and damage control resulting from uncontrolled distribution of alcoholic promotions such as ‘two for one’ pricing of drinks were problem police should handle resulted over time in a very positive change of attitude. They came to realise that they were attracting the disruptive elements but missing more desirable business because of their practices (Fisher 1994). Other communities have begun to address the issue of community policing to reduce unsupervised and potentially dangerous activities and events such as new year’s eve celebrations and football matches – the horrific examples of mass deaths from poorly managed crowds in the U.K. in particular, having a tremendous impact on social planning (Mellor 1993).

The thesis of this paper is to examine a range of educational solutions across a broad cross-section of social institutions as a means of beginning to establish what underlying philosophical bases determine action. It is heartening to perceive the number, diversity and quality of such educational programs and to begin to gather support for the notion that violence can be resolved through education, albeit a wide and intensive education that places expectations and standards on deviant members of society. We still have a major task in creating a group of citizens who feel connected to their communities, supported by the systems and willing to contribute to the maintenance of the social order. It remains a task for every individual and educators are a vital resource in the overall plan.

JEAN B. JENKIN
JUNE 1995
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Resolving violence through education: An anti-violence curriculum for secondary students

JEAN JENKIN

That violence can be resolved through education is an attractive philosophical proposition. It empowers us to believe that we can shape individuals' behaviour so that their self-control guarantees our safety, and that we can affect social and institutional constructs to prevent destructive acts. It is a hopeful and positive message and one which can be categorically substantiated by examining the longitudinal data - most people in society are not overtly, chronically or even episodically violent. Some educational process is at work in the broader society which is generally successful, at least to date, in producing a non-violent population.

This is not to suggest, however, that most people are pacifists. On the contrary - violence is part of the human condition. Violent impulses are inherent in all humanity, and we can all only do our best to resist, redirect, suppress or otherwise manage such urges. If we view violent behaviour from an individual psychology perspective, we must acknowledge that it is individual choices which determine the level, degree and impact of violent acts in our society. The only cause of violence is choice. While there are various compounding and contributing factors put forward, including biological determinants (Egger, 1995), environmental and social pressures (Bowie, 1991), physiological components, even claims of overwhelming justification - in the final analysis, there is a moment in time when the individual chooses violence over all other options as a means of resolution to a problem or situation. Irrespective of the cultural milieu, the family or other circumstances of the conflict, and having regard for the limited repertoire of alternative behaviours violent individuals may have to draw on, the violent act is a selected response. Why some individuals choose violence on a regular or episodic basis to deal with their conflict situations or for self-gratification, is a question for psychiatry. The question for educators is how non-violent responses are acquired and practised and how can we teach such responses? It is not those of us who struggle to remain in control that are in need of intervention - rather it is those who see no reason to maintain control - who enjoy the rage and the power of assault and who prefer to use their violent capacities to their own advantage. These are the individuals whose social education somehow deviates from ours - whose values, moral development and attitudes towards violence may well differ from ours, and certainly whose affective development in terms of empathy and attachment seems to deviate...
from the norm (Artz and Rieckin, 1994). The most intransigent and dangerous violent individuals, however, are not those who fail to empathise and attach to significant others. They are the individuals who fully understand the impact of their violent acts, and who still choose to engage them.

Some spectacularly violent episodes in Australian history demand that we focus attention on the propensity for violence in particular individuals and to examine the potential for success of the concepts of prevention, intervention and anti-violence initiatives.

Resolving violence through education is the focus of efforts in many societal institutions and teachers can be relieved that the full responsibility for addressing this issue is not seen to rest with them in the isolation of the classroom. A number of perspectives on this philosophical approach are developing in medical, judicial and community organisations (Jenkin, 1995).

**GENDER - A KEY FACTOR**

Lombroso, a century ago, contended that females were less well-advanced in an evolutionary sense and that their childlike natures determined their lack of inclination towards crime (Lombroso, 1895). Since then various theorists have proposed a range of reasons why women are not identified in crimes of violence including their natural capacity for deceit and concealment (Pollack, 1950) evidently facilitating avoidance of detection; lack of male hormones (Cowie, Cowie and Slater, 1968), a preference for sexual crime such as prostitution (Konopka, 1966) and socialisation processes (Berger, 1989; Gilligan, 1982).

Contradictory arguments for female/male comparative involvement abound in the literature, for example the emancipation of women through feminism in the 1970’s was seen as a reason for an increase in female involvement in anti-social and criminal activity. That is, their ‘improved’ social status in terms of wealth, access to employment and so on were seen as contributory factors to their involvement in crime. On the other hand, it is argued, the lack of wealth and lack of employment contribute to male criminality. The suggestion being that improvement in these conditions would reduce their criminal orientations (Adler, 1991).

This issue is examined by Chesney-Lind and Sheldon (1992) as they attempt to formulate a research base of female delinquency and crime by examining theories of masculinization premised on male experiences. The gender differential needs to be carefully analysed in sociological and psychological terms for such a base to be established...

New research explaining female involvement, violence (Artz, in press) demonstrates clearly that while females are involved to a much lesser degree than males, the psychological, social and physical factors which correlate are the same for both. Girls who are violent are more similar to boys who are violent than they are to girls who are non-violent. Artz identifies correlational factors which include similar exposure to and experience of violence, a preference for violent behaviour, anti-social behaviour and positive attitudes
related to sex, drugs and alcohol use as well as a deliberate development of skills in violence perpetration. The rates are different as are the targets - while young males are most at risk of a violent end in society and most at risk from each other, and violent young women are likely to target other young women, rather than males, overall the tally for violent acts is overwhelmingly weighted towards males.

Maleness itself is probably not 'causal' as some have suggested but the social and situational forces which combine with masculinity may be. (Egger, 1995). Non-violent men, therefore, will be the most powerful advocates for non-violence in any educational program or anti-violence intervention but until non-violent males accept the gender differential, demand to be seen as non-violent first and male second, the defensiveness regarding this issue will continue to impede progress in resolving it. (Wallace, 1995)

One major concern with the programs currently operating overseas is the gender neutrality of the content and presentation format (Orom, 1995). There is no attempt to acknowledge the differences between males’ and females’ involvement and experiences with violence. The curriculum described in this paper is unique in the sense that it has deliberately sought to identify gender-based needs in dealing with violence and is designed to be presented to both gender segregated and joint groups to facilitate discussion.

Young men gain from the curriculum an insight into and empathy for, the victim of violence and results of violent interactions (Jenkin, 1995). They are introduced to concepts of assertiveness which suggest that strength and masculinity are not compatible with violence towards others particularly women and children. The purpose is to provide a process of re-structuring to the cognitive patterns which violent males use to explain violent actions. Young women benefit from sessions which attempt to empower them in help-seeking and assertiveness. They are consistently encouraged to develop confidence in their own capabilities and to locate the locus of control and attribution for survival within their own abilities and efforts.

THE CASE FOR THE ANTI-VIOLENCE CURRICULUM

The preferred approach to violence intervention in programs developed overseas is 'violence prevention' - in fact, many of the curricula and materials currently available are titled 'violence prevention'. Little wonder therefore that their outcomes, if they are evaluated, demonstrate little or no reduction in violence - they clearly do not 'prevent' violence. The problem lies in the selection of the program orientation and objectives.

Violence cannot be 'prevented' in the short-term - certainly not in the short-term offered by a classroom curriculum. Indeed, two studies in Canada demonstrated an increase in reports of violent acts following implementation of district wide or recognised commercial violence prevention programs - in one case a rise of 47 per cent was recorded (Arzt in press). What does this tell us? In all probability, those who were non-violent prior to the program remain so, and those who were violent continue to engage in violent acts at
the increased rate noticed across society as a whole. The results look causative but, of course, unless originally non-violent individuals have been stimulated to become violent as a result of the program, there's no real connection. A number of factors not related to the program may well be operating within the community including increased reporting as a direct outcome of raised awareness due to the program.

A clear distinction must be drawn between violence prevention and anti-violence programs in terms of their objectives, content and impact. Only long term education will help 'prevent' violence - as it already does for most people in society. Many of the current programs focus on social skills development (empathy training, interaction skills, anger management, negotiation, mediation, conflict and dispute resolution, and so on). It is self-evident that such skills cannot be left to chance and must in some way either formally or informally be transmitted to all members of society to ensure survival. How did we do this before the advent of violence 'prevention' programs? It was a social process - it still is. We continue to develop such skills throughout life and become progressively more adept at drawing on these capacities as we mature. There is an element of precipitation in the conduct of these programs - we actually want young people to demonstrate skills well beyond those we would have expected to see in them even a decade ago. Young people are demonstrating a remarkable capacity to mediate with peers, to engage in conflict resolution, to use non-violent means to deal with problems (King, 1995). Many programs are being taught to the 'converted' - to young people who would not have engaged in violence even without the program! Some of the mistaken assumptions of these programs include:

- that there are pro-violent behaviours and attitudes in the individuals who are undertaking the program - when these possibilities are not examined beforehand. Attitudes and behaviour measures pre-program are rarely cited;
- that violent individuals can have their violent behaviours and values changed through a formal and systematic education program presented in isolation from the broader community. There may be no such relationship demonstrated - having the information does not guarantee that they will act on it and unless this is measured beforehand, no conclusions can be drawn; and
- that exposure to violence necessarily produces violent individuals and that such exposure teaches violent behaviour. The evidence is overwhelming that this is not the case. Many, perhaps most individuals, who are exposed to real violence develop withdrawn and depressed behaviours as a result of exposure. The distinction to be made in this analysis is between 'real' and 'simulated' violence - there is a clear difference in impact and outcomes. A more careful analysis of the literature, particularly as it relates to this distinction and pro-violent orientation is warranted. Violent behaviour has been demonstrated throughout history without the extreme role models currently presented
in 'violent' media images. To focus efforts and resources on attempting to reduce the impact of violent videos, when no impact is evident for most viewers, is to waste limited time and effort which could be more effectively focussed on individuals in need of intervention.

Violence prevention is a long-term goal - a life-long goal. Where these programs are failing is in their original conception - not in the content or delivery - but in the objective of preventing violence in the long term. Most violence is already prevented by social processes and briefly applied programs will never prevent the violence we see in modern urban cultures. These efforts are not wasted, however, if they reinforce and improve socially transmitted attitudes and behaviours which reject violence. Resistance levels can be developed and maintained, strengthening and formalising conscious choices to avoid violence, and put forward an anti-violence message.

The case can therefore be made for an anti-violence approach which complements and reinforces the anti-violence socialisation process. While the claim of violence prevention programs is that they can prevent violence, the simple claim and objectives of an anti-violence curriculum is that it will inform, direct, guide and teach information related to violence.

This is premised on the assumption that learning about the origins, indicators and topography of violence will contribute to a better knowledge base and understanding about concepts of violence and may inform behaviour and attitudes. This, combined with a generally successful anti-violent socialisation process is the foundation of the thesis - resolving violence through education.

It is also clear that such an approach can only be effective as part of a comprehensive management plan. That policy, training, organisational change and individual therapeutic and remedial interventions need also to be devised to ensure a non-violent culture (in schools or society) is the approach suggested here.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO ANTI-VIOLENCE INTERVENTION

Some clarification is needed of the place of the anti-violence curriculum in the overall attempt to develop an anti-violence culture or orientation, whether in an organisation, school or other formal setting. The comprehensive approach has been variously described and elaborated as P.E.A.C.E. (Policy, Education, Action, Coping, Evaluation, Slee, 1993). P.A.C.T. (Policy, Action, Collaboration, Training, Cohen, 1993) and a thorough approach to managing bullying (Rigby, 1996). The same fundamental components are described in these varied philosophical approaches and the same message is clearly presented - a comprehensive approach is needed to intervention.

The comprehensive approach comprises five key components - each of which further comprises a number of elements:

- Policy;
- Organisational restructuring and resources;
• Preparation of personnel;
• Generic educational curricula;
• Individual interventions.
Each of the elements must be included if any attempt is made at intervention in violence. The curriculum described here fits into the category Generic educational curricula: it is a generic program available to all students in the selected group. To select one individual element and develop it to the exclusion of all others will not guarantee success, nor provide the thoroughness of treatment necessary for intervention. To develop a policy for non-violence, for example, yet neglect individual intervention will not produce a desired effect. Briefly:
• Policy for a non-violent culture (Jenkin, 1993) includes statements which clearly encompass all members of the organisation. In schools, the policy must refer to teachers and parents as well as students, in industry or community the policy must apply to the executive and authorities as well as to the workers and the public.
• Organisational re-structuring involves an examination and possible re-deployment of personnel and resources to facilitate a non- or anti-violent culture. It involves changes to domains of responsibility and intensive collaborative efforts to develop pro-active approaches in the long term.
• Preparation of personnel includes all stakeholders and participants - in schools it would include parents, auxiliary staff and community members as well as teachers and students, in in-service or training programs to assist the development of appropriate skills and attitudes.
• Generic educational curricula applied to all members of the community to inform and effect their behaviour and attitudes, is an important component of an overall plan for an anti-violence approach.
• Individual interventions which are remedial, therapeutic and sometimes punitive also need to be incorporated into the overall approach.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRICULUM

Processes
In response to a perceived need in high schools for a curriculum specifically focussed on violence prevention and intervention, the Resolving Violence Through Education (Resolve I) (Jenkin, 1996) curriculum was developed during 1993, presented in a range of settings during 1994 and accepted for publication in 1995. At the time of developing the program, the author had been invited to consult with a range of schools, detention centres and an adult prison with regard to anti-violence education and violent incidents, as well as to conduct in-service activities for teaching personnel, psychiatric nursing staff, youth workers and management in juvenile justice and the Worksafe Authority. This range of experiences and opportunities provided the
foundation philosophies and indications for appropriate outcomes for the curriculum. Moreover, it assisted in crystallising narrowly focussed and measurable objectives for the overall initiative.

The program comprises ten modules of information supplemented by homework tasks, inclass worksheets and activities devised to provide practical and relevant involvement for young people. Modules provide all the materials for one lesson or a series of lessons dependent on the approach selected and may be presented as a comprehensive ten week program or be adapted in a cross-curricular fashion to ensure the anti-violence message is presented in a variety of subjects or classes. The module content is arranged in an hierarchical mode and presents factual information in the early modules (statistics and perceptions of violence in society, physiology and origins of violence), to dealing with gender and relationship issues, prevention and strategies for coping and the development of assertiveness and communication skills.

Proposed outcomes/impact

The curriculum is specifically described as an anti-violence program devised for adolescents to introduce skills and information for managing violence. It aims to raise awareness of violence issues and to measure changes in the level of awareness and attitudes towards violence as well as the acquisition of anti-violence concepts. Specific criteria such as these are anticipated; as a result of participating in the curriculum, clients will:

- acquire specific knowledge about the incidence, nature and composition of violent acts in Australian society;
- become aware of the social, interpersonal and environmental factors impacting on violence;
- be able to describe the physiological and emotional indicators of violence;
- identify antecedents to violence and reinforcing factors;
- develop a range of responses to deal with violence;
- discuss gender issues and related factors relevant to violence; and
- express anti-violent attitudes.

In terms of impact, participants are required to state the extent to which the program has provided new information, motivated a greater concern for the wellbeing of others and what personal changes in behaviour, attitudes and knowledge they believe have resulted. The desired impact is a shift towards less acceptance of violence and violent attitudes following the program.

Instruments for measurement of changed attitudes/knowledge

In order to determine the changes to attitudes and knowledge and concepts acquisition, two instruments are included in the program: the Attitudes to Violence questionnaire and the Concepts Acquisition Form.
Attitudes towards violence

The instrument is designed to include items across four factors: The self and violence; 'What is violence?'; causes of violence; and 'When is violence okay?'. Items are worded negatively (that is, they are pro-violent) and responses are recorded on a five-point Likert scale, with agree, and strongly agree responses contributing to a higher score and indicating a more pro-violent attitude, for example, Item 5. *Homosexuals deserve to be beaten*. An uninformed or pro-violent response would be SA or A resulting in a score of 5 or 4 and contributing to a strong pro-violent overall attitude score.

Details of application and calculation of results are included in the program. Put simply, participants who agree with negative statements demonstrate a more pro-violent attitude and will achieve a higher score. Statements used in the questionnaire have all been drawn from common pro-violent attitudes expressed by young people and others in the community. It cannot be extrapolated from this that pro-violent attitudes necessarily result in violent behaviour, or *vice versa*. The focus, therefore, is to change expressed attitudes, not to claim that by doing so we have prevented violence but to demonstrate that a shift is possible. All of the negative attitudes expressed in the questionnaire are dealt with in the curriculum, giving participants the opportunity to gain further knowledge and insight into the issues (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Average Pre Program Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average Post Program Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Wagga Wagga</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80-45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooma Gaol</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76-51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville South High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>83-57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71-48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: High scores indicate an acceptance of violence across a range of factors: self-use, physical punishment, cultural groups

Concepts acquisition questionnaire

This instrument is completed by the presenter of the curriculum for each participant as the program proceeds, as a result of examination of their class participation, worksheets and homework produced. Review of results will
indicate where knowledge has not been acquired and will alert the presenter to
the necessity for remediation or re-teaching of the material to ensure that the
designated information is acquired during the program or in remediation
sessions. The purpose of the instrument is to verify the effectiveness of the
program in terms of delivering new information regarding violence. The chief
purpose of the overall program to improve levels of knowledge and attitude
are thereby co-dependent.

**EVALUATION ISSUES**

Evaluation of violence 'prevention' programs to date has offered little support
for their efficacy. In 1991, a comprehensive study of the state of the art was
carried out (Wilson, Brewer and Cohen, 1991) and eighty-three programs
from across the United States of America were examined. Their results
showed that 16 per cent conducted no evaluation of impact, 39 per cent
collected participant 'feedback' (mostly related to processes) and only 21 per
cent conducted outcomes evaluation. They and others identify several key
issues for the evaluation process.

- No convincing body of data could be assembled for comparative
  purposes since the objectives, processes and populations of the
  programs involved such wide variability.
- No clear set of guiding principles have yet been developed by which to
  formulate such programs as the empirical and theoretical bases are not
  yet established.
- The simple measures used such as attitude change and behaviour
  modification are insufficient to determine whether 'prevention' has
  occurred. Only pre- and post-measures and longitudinal data can give a
  clear picture of long-term effects.
- The complex nature of violence and therefore of violence 'prevention'
  require multiple measures and sophisticated research design which few
  programs have the resources to develop. Funds are used to develop,
  disseminate and present the programs in the 'hope' that some good will
  be derived.
- The ability to predict or prevent violent behaviour in individuals, on the
  basis of short-term changes in knowledge and self reports of attitudes
  and behaviour change, is questionable.
- There is an absence of baseline data or consideration of gender, race or
  developmental differences among participant populations to determine
  outcomes or needs for these sub groups.

As discussed earlier, many of these problems arise because of claims that
programs can 'prevent' violence. This is ambitious and misleading. Such
programs can only expose participants to different cognitive orientations
and knowledge and check for acquisition. In terms of attitudes, for example, there
is no evidence to show that a change in attitude will result in a change in
behaviour (Perry, Apostol and Scott, 1988; Westbrook, Legge and Pennay,
1993) and further individuals who express an abhorrence of 'violence', the
concept, nevertheless agree or strongly agree with pro-violent statements (Jenkins, 1995; Arzt, in press). When programs clarify their aim to be anti-violence in focus, claim only to provide new knowledge, information and skills related to an anti-violence orientation and check only that the knowledge, information and skills have been acquired then we can begin to address the long-term issues of application and generalisation. Practice and reinforcement of the newly acquired attributes needs to be monitored and consistently guided if real changes to outcomes and perhaps prevention of violence can be achieved.

Arguments have been presented throughout this paper which respond to the issues. It is evident that systematic and empirical data will need to be collected if program designers are to continue to label legitimately their programs 'violence prevention'. From a purely educational perspective, the value of our anti-violence curriculum can only be assessed in the same way as any other curriculum. We teach mathematics because we believe the knowledge is valuable (even though there are individuals who are expert at mathematics without being taught, and individuals who will never be functional in mathematics despite being taught). For the most part, a mathematics curriculum is useful. We hope, as an educational process, that exposure to mathematics will lead to acquisition of mathematics concepts and application of knowledge gained - but apart from the immediate assessment of this during mathematics instruction, we cannot ensure a lifetime of commitment to the principles learned. Nevertheless, we continue to insist that all students be exposed to mathematics curricula. The assurances are no more permanent for anti-violence curricula. A shift in attitude, a newly-acquired concept, will not ensure a life-time commitment to the principles proposed. It is still worthwhile presenting the material.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The content of the 'Resolving Violence Through Education' program was tried out on a voluntary basis in a range of settings in New South Wales during 1994 including: Monaro High School, St. Andrews, Wagga Wagga, Granville South High School, Minda Detention Centre, Cooma Gaol and quite a number of others who enquired and requested participation. The listed locations agreed by contract to gather information, provide feedback for analysis and to facilitate improvements to the program.

Each participant organisation nominated an individual to monitor and conduct the program and provide data.

- Prior to implementation, the Attitudes Towards Violence questionnaire was presented to the targeted year group, some of whom were to participate ultimately in the program. Students were identified by a self-selected numbering process so that only they and one other staff member knew the number. The presenter did not know the identity of the numbered individual. Scores were reported by number identification and a brief explanation of what the score indicated (a more or less pro-
The program was delivered to the selected year group’s class (Monaro - Year 11, St Michaels - Year 7, Granville South - Year 9) or the total population in the detention and gaol locations (Minda - 8 students, Cooma - 15 adult males who were convicted pedophiles) over a period of time determined by the timetable and resources of the participant organisation. All locations used the curriculum in weekly personal development, health, and physical education programs, although modes of presentation, in particular cross-curricula approaches, are suggested. Necessary adoptions were made at various settings - none of which would be likely to effect knowledge requisitions.

Following completion of the curriculum, the Attitudes questionnaire was presented again and since both questionnaires were identified with the same number, a comparison was possible between the two.

CONCLUSION
Quantitative analysis of the attitudes score indicated shifts towards a less-accepting expressed attitude and although the results were not statistically significant, the general trend is most encouraging. In virtually all of the responses examined, participants were less likely to agree or strongly agree with previously held pro-violent attitudes (see Table 1). Qualitatively, the evaluation feedback was most encouraging with students and other participants expressing views which endorsed the introduction of the curricular content and message into the various education programs involved. Participant feedback as evaluation of the curriculum is overwhelmingly positive. Students indicate that they will use the knowledge to inform others, that they will reject pro-violent attitudes in themselves and others and that they have changed their pro-violent views.

Inmates of correctional juvenile and adult facilities, while expressing the belief that they are, in fact, already non-violent in their orientation, nevertheless appreciate the opportunity to discuss relevant issues and gain new insights and knowledge. In some ways, the curriculum has assisted individuals to re-assess their personal definitions of violence, and they have been challenged to become reflective. If a convicted pedophile believes he is non-violent, then the curriculum may help him see the discrepancy between his personal definition and the societal view. If a convicted juvenile murderer believes his action was justifiable, discussion of the origins and perceptions of violence in our society may provide for introspection, if not contrition. In short, the anti-violence curriculum can only be educative, it cannot prove to be transformational.

The curriculum is part of a comprehensive approach to dealing with violence and offers the opportunity to identify overtly pro-violent participants. As a result of this process, individual therapeutic, remedial and instructional programs can be provided for these individuals in an attempt to restructure
their attitudes and increase their knowledge towards a less accepting viewpoint. This is the critical long-term objective - no more and no less. If this process contributes to less violence, it has done so through education.
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ABSTRACT

Despite an apparently widely accepted belief that viewing violence influences young people to engage in violent behaviour, this paper presents a critical analysis of current research which demonstrates that the evidence for such an assertion is weak and unsubstantiated. Fundamental to the mistaken claim is a failure to differentiate real from simulated violence in experimental, observational and analytical studies of the aggressive behaviours of young people. Despite sometimes excessive and always unnecessary viewing of violent media images, the vast majority of viewers of violence will never engage in similar behaviour. A more parsimonious approach is to examine the psychological and developmental buffers which seem to protect young people from the influence of the media and maintain acceptable and non-violent interaction repertoires. This information may contribute substantially to an understanding of the development of violent behaviour and suitable intervention and prevention strategies. Further, the issue of desensitisation to violence often seen as a consequence of violence viewing for young people, is addressed.
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There is a prevailing community view often reinforced by newspaper analyses of crime, that there is a causal link between violence in society and violence portrayed in the entertainment media (Goldsmith 1997). The simplicity of the analysis does not detract from its impact and a plethora of research studies and reports – up to 3,000 by recent accounts (Oaks 1995) – seem to reinforce the connection. At least in the print media there appears to be no doubt that viewing violence inevitably makes young people violent. Given that millions of young people daily view on-screen violence in a variety of forms – cinema, video, computer games etc – without exhibiting violence, however, it would seem much more parsimonious to conclude that such links are at best tenuous. Very few violence viewers engage in real violence in real life and it seems self-evident that a causal link has not been established for the most part between violence viewing and subsequent violent behaviour. While violence viewing contributes nothing of value to the social and moral development of young people, it is argued here that nor does it precipitate violence. Evidently, there are strong mitigating factors at work in society and in particular in the world of young people which ensures that despite regular exposure to on-screen violence, the vast majority of young viewers do not seek to emulate what they view.
It is far more informative therefore, to consider why such viewing does not encourage most viewers to behave violently. Identification of the underlying social, moral and psychological underpinnings which produce this result may well provide the essential components of a successful education program or other intervention for the vulnerable few for whom violence viewing does have a negative impact by reinforcing their violent propensities. Researchers have ascribed developmentally anticipated aggressive play to destructive media influences; they extrapolate from minor aggressive incidents to the likelihood of major acts of aggression in later life; they attempt to demonstrate that any overt aggression observed in the behavioural repertoire of young people is a consequence of abstract media influences. These links however, have not been established and much more careful analysis of current research is warranted.

There are several recurrent themes in the professional literature and social discourse on violence viewing, the most frequent of which are:

- watching media violence causes young people to become violent or aggressive (Arnow 1995, Ballard 1995, , Irwin and Gross 1995, Strasburger 1995);
• watching media violence de-sensitises young people to violence (Levine 1994, Moliter 1994. Botha 1993, Young and Young 1997);

These mistaken beliefs require redress in order to provide a new analysis of what is an unfounded central allegation that violence viewing influences young people to engage in violence.

The fundamental issue in discussing the impact of violence viewing is to differentiate real from simulated violence. If young people watch 'pretend' violence, and then re-enact the behaviours observed, for the most part without incurring or causing injury, this cannot be interpreted as media violence viewing causing violent behaviour. Simulated violence is not violence. Pretending to be violent is not actually being violent.

The intentionality of the act is critical to the definition. Nor can the reality of the act be diminished. There must be real harm, hurt, damage, or other consequences for the act to be a violent act. Violent simulations – unless enacted in order to be threatening – are not real violence. Even quite young people are capable of differentiating real and 'pretend' violence, contrary to popular belief.

Further, it cannot be assumed that the simulated violence young people view in various forms of media is generalised to their real world and lives. "Violent" video games for example are viewed as:

"sort of funny – cos you know it's not real" and "it looks funny when you just grab the neck and rip off their heads and you see the spine dangling" or "it’s not really people – it’s guys, but they’re monsters’ an ‘it’s like blowing a hole in them and they keep walking – real people couldn’t do that” Young & Young (1997)
While these are not attractive depictions, nor are they evidence that viewers will try to emulate them. Young people are clearly capable of recognising the exaggeration and entertainment intended in such media, and the unlikelihood of the activities occurring in reality – there are no blurred boundaries in their perception. Given the hundreds of thousands of young people engaged in daily ‘violent’ interactive video games and video film viewing the failure of the medium to incite violent behaviour in contravention of social mores and norms is compelling evidence of its ineffectiveness. Watching violence obviously does not make young people violent no matter how excessively ‘violent’ they may be seem to adult viewers. Even young people identified as ‘at risk’ through their educational and minor criminal backgrounds, when interviewed about the impact of violent video games indicated:

- "fighting games don’t lead to street fighting – people worry about that but it’s just paranoia"
- "I don’t need a video game to be violent – it’s not games, it’s other people that set you off"
- "there are no repercussions from the computer, but if you did it in real life it would be real sad" (Young & Young op cit).

Griffiths (1997) suggests that computer game playing is an “absorbing and harmless activity” which may be problematic for a small minority of young people. The views expressed in their study reinforce early research findings by Lefkowitz et al (1973) that those prone to violent behaviours will select violence viewing, but that violence viewing does not create the violent tendency.
Cesarone (1994) suggests that the interactive nature of video games may have a more harmful effect than passively watching ‘violent acts’ on television, however, the interviews conducted by Young and Young (1997) seem to indicate that entertainment and recreation are the major priorities and outcomes for young people engaged in video ‘violence’. The concern for ‘protection’ of young people from video ‘violence’ may have reached extreme proportions when we consider that Chen (1994) found that of forty videos rated, only twelve met his vigorous non-violent criteria and several Disney corporation products were rejected as unsuitable even though they were prescribed for pre-schoolers. Such sanitization of content for young minds will surely result in a generation of young people without resilience. Strasburger (1993) et al point to video games and rock music videos and songs and other media as potential influences on adolescent aggression, and while there can be no doubt that some rock lyrics illustrate violent attitudes and behaviours -

“Beat her til she’s red and raw, crack the whip, it hardly stings the bitch”.

(“She Likes it Rough”. Thrasher quoted in Goldsmith 1997,)

there is no evidence that this incites young people to engage in such behaviour. Sadly, such lyrics may well be a reflection of reality for some young people and do not introduce new concepts or ideas. In this case the reality of the experiences, not the recording of them in a song is likely to have the greater impact. Nevertheless, it is unlikely to lead to similar behaviour.

Some researchers take a particularly glum view of society suggesting that young people are generally being “conditioned to violence and hatred through war toys, video games and mass media” (Arnow 1998).
While pro-peace and anti-violence approaches (Jenkin 1996) are certainly to be encouraged the effective psychological conditioning which happens in most families even those with such toys and games – will be sufficient to maintain the majority non-violent status quo. Ballard et al (1995) seemed surprised to find that male college students registered high cardiovascular reactions after playing a highly stimulating ‘violent’ video game than after playing billiards and cautions that the level of ‘violence’ watched causes the biological reaction. Without discussing the implications of these results with the students to discover whether in fact they felt inclined to engage in real violence as a result of the game, it is very difficult to identify a connection. Many activities result in psychological stimulation without inciting violent behaviours and based on cardiovascular responses alone, a quick run could result in a dangerous level of pro-violent sentiment!

The notion of ‘modelling’ aggressive or violent behaviour can be traced back to the experiments of Bandura (1973) on his observation of young children in a laboratory situation, whereby an adult experimenter was viewed behaving ‘aggressively’ towards a large plastic doll. Their responses to the unfortunate plastic model (bobo doll), after watching, were predictably enthusiastic. They too, when given the opportunity enjoyed ‘beating’ the model. To deduce from this, however, that young people who watch ‘violence’ will model ‘violence’ is completely unsubstantiated, since they were, in fact, watching simulated violence on a toy specifically created for vigorous rough and tumble ‘play’.
Not only did the model not show any distress or pain – in fact it grinned vacuously throughout the ordeal – it just kept coming back for more as it was designed to do. These children watched and engaged in simulated violence and no evidence is presented that they subsequently developed into violent individuals.

Throughout the last twenty years a key factor in differentiating the responses of young people to violence viewing seems to have been overlooked. Analyses of these observations did not seem to take account of several important factors:

a) the children were well aware of the function of a Bobo Doll and therefore would not have been surprised, let alone distressed, to see it “beaten”

b) the adult engaged in the ‘violent’ behaviour was not angry or frightening to the children, and was engaged in vigorous play which was quite appealing to them

c) her behaviour was not interpreted by them as ‘violent’ as it was neither harmful nor socially inappropriate

d) the doll is an inanimate plaything designed for the purpose so of course the children were likely to copy behaviours, which are not only fun but also sanctioned by adults!

The critical question, which needed to be answered in this situation, was whether those same children, after viewing an adult in an angry or aggressive mood physically abusing a real person, would have responded differently?
There is little doubt that they would have been distressed, afraid and anxious. Viewing real and simulated violence is not the same and there must be grave doubt that they would have taken the opportunity to emulate the adult were it offered in a genuinely violent situation. Young people may well simulate 'violence' particularly when so much is sanctioned by society, but they nevertheless retain their links to reality by refraining from engaging in real acts of violence. Even young people who are exposed to real violence in their family or community rarely respond by developing violent behaviours themselves. (Spatz-Widom 1998, Roberts 1998). Instead, most respond with trauma, withdrawal and depression.

HOW IS VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR DEVELOPED?

Violent behaviours are learned behaviours. Understanding the process of learning to behave in a violent manner is fundamental to understanding why media violence is generally unlikely to teach young people to behave in such a way. Developmental psychology informs us that children are programmed from birth for learning and indeed, having discovered the principles of learning which guarantee our messages will be absorbed by children, teachers and parents devote countless hours reinforcing usually pro-social information and behaviour. Most children follow a predictable pathway of intellectual, moral and social development. The essential components for teaching a skill or behaviour include: motivation, instruction, demonstration, practice, opportunity, reinforcement and approval (Berk 1996).
Children are exposed to each of these processes through their continuous interactions with their parents, peers and others and these usually positive influences assist in the development of appropriate behaviours and attitudes.

There are young people, however, whose major influences are neither appropriate nor positive. For such individuals violent behaviours may well be demonstrated, practised and vicariously instructed, as well as resulting in reinforcement and approval when the child engages in the behaviour. The scene is set for the creation of a violent individual. The individual will more than likely also have positive role models for life – at school, in the community and even on television, however the major influence is his home environment and the significant adults therein. Having established for the child the acceptable range of behaviours for the particular milieu (the violent home) the child will inevitably seek out opportunities for reinforcement inside or outside the home.

Hurting others will often result in these children achieving power and goods they would otherwise not have. There are some individuals who prefer to engage in behaviour that is threatening and violent sometimes because they have no other repertoire upon which to draw. They will be delighted to observe similar behaviour and situations on television or other screens and may well append their own violent repertoire of behaviour with effective demonstrations viewed. Violent behaviour, having been established through a thorough process of training simply requires reinforcement to be maintained.
Violent behaviour obviously then is not always linked to anger, and indeed is often selected, according to violent individuals, for the gratification of their needs for power, domination and sadism – they learn to enjoy hurting others. While the majority of young people in our society are effectively immunised against the impact of violent viewing therefore through pro-social experiences and expectations, young people who are subject to inadequate parenting, or who have developed a psychological or personal orientation towards violence, are likely to select violent viewing to reinforce their world view, as well as for entertainment. Lefkowitz et al (1977) was one of the first to demonstrate that violent media viewing is unlikely to have the effect of causing violent behaviour, but may well supplement the already violent behaviour of susceptible individuals. This may account for the low correlation between watching video violence and performing real violence among the many individuals who engage in the activity of viewing.

It should come as no surprise, then to find, that violence viewing is selected by those who have a propensity or preference for violent behaviour nor that such individuals may well select such viewing in order to increase their own repertoire of behaviour – the key factor again being motivation. In each instance the already motivated viewer selects the product which ‘fits’ their own situation, sometimes to improve their skills, sometimes for entertainment. There are many others who select the same video for entertainment alone – without any motivation to develop or acquire the skills demonstrated.
Ageback (1997) suggests a mutual cause and effect relationship in which more aggressive children tend to gravitate towards media violence. She is convinced that 90% - 95% of the aggression, however, stems from psychological, familial and environmental factors. Schramm (1996) assures us that movies can rarely be blamed as the sole cause of anti-social conduct but cites instances of the effect on susceptible youngsters, supporting the view that the pathology is more likely to be present prior to viewing.

Parental supervision, monitoring and censorship of viewing are also critical factors in violence viewing. Parents who reinforce and engage in violence themselves are less likely to find violent videos objectionable, or to feel the need to ‘protect’ young people from them. Access is a critical factor. Kromar and Cantor (1997) examined parent/child viewing choice conversations and found that effective parents used more negative affect when discussing violent videos, while children were likely to request or favour programs with more restrictive ratings. Many of the young people interviewed in the Young and Young (1997) study were unaware that there were restrictions on video games and claimed they could play with any of the games. Parental concerns about violence were acknowledged but these young people dismissed the influence of violent games as insignificant.
Biggens (1997) states that when young people choose a diet of heavy violence it is an indication of poor conditions at home – “when no-one monitors what children watch, they are in danger for other reasons – a lack of caretaking”. Such neglect coupled with spasmodic though violent parental attention could provide the ideal condition for the development of a violent individual. Support for the view that parental and environmental factors can mitigate against the influence of violence viewing can be found in the report by Huesmann and Bachrach (1986). They found that there was a significant difference between the responses of city children and children living in Kibbutz, with city children more likely to be aggressive. Kibbutz children were not influenced to engage in aggressive behaviour following violence viewing – a factor attributed to the close familial environment of the Kibbutz.

On this point, researchers have been diligent in recent years documenting the non-violent responses of young people to the simulated violence they view. The ‘reality factor’ is a critical issue though not in confirming that the more realistically violent the fiction the more violent the young person is likely to become. Rather, examined on a continuum from real-life, personally experienced violence to the least effective cartoon-style antics of various characters, it becomes clear that nothing matches the impact of real-life violence. If it was true that the more realistic the violence viewed, the greater the likelihood of the young viewer becoming violent, then those young people who witness and experience real life violence on a daily basis would be most likely to become violent. Very few such individuals do indeed become trained in violence and develop violent skills and strategies.
However, the majority of children exposed to real life violence do not become violent – they become withdrawn and depressed. Children in international areas of civil unrest and wars remain silently traumatised for many years, as did the adult soldiers before them. Van der Voort et al (1997) express concern for the emotional reactions elicited from young people viewing extremely violent movies, films and games. Theirs and other substantial research now documents the fact that young people are much more likely to respond with fear and anxiety, often persisting long after the program is ended, than they are to respond with pro-violent feelings. Cantor (1997) has thoroughly examined children’s reactions across various age groups and has determined that there are close developmental links to the fear response. Young children are likely to be afraid of the appearance of violent characters, while older children become afraid when they apply their cognitive predictions and analysis processes to the drama – particularly if the violence could happen in reality. Ramsden (1997) found that 48% of children interviewed were uncomfortable when they watched ‘people being shot’, ‘killing’ and ‘blood’ as well as animals hunting each other. None reported an urge to go forth and emulate. Fear of becoming a victim, rather than identification with the perpetrator, was a much more likely response by children in these studies. Buckingham (1997) found viewers did not ‘become Freddy Kruger’ but more usually feared becoming his next target.
Various coping strategies such as declaring blood to be tomato sauce, and hiding behind large cushions or companions seemed to ease the anxiety but little – and while there was a vicarious thrill attached to suffering the visual impact of the ‘violence’, nobody expressed a desire to copy the character. Valkenburg (1997) quite sensibly states that it is not a serious problem for children to be a little afraid when viewing television or videos – and that this can contribute to the development of resilience and competence in later life. She does not advocate regular or intense doses of fear-inducing video violence and prescribes adult supervision and discussion with children to alleviate real concerns.

The issue of desensitisation is a recurrent and again poorly supported contention regarding the influence of violent media. It is impossible to imagine most young people becoming desensitised to real violence as a result of watching simulated violence. Moliter (1994) expresses the concern that exposure to media violence desensitised children to real-life aggression and further that children tend to tolerate more aggressive behaviour of others if they have first viewed violence on film. There can be two explanations for these results – watching aggression causes children to become passive and therefore tolerant or accepting of aggression or that watching video violence is unlikely to cause children to react violently, neither of which argument supports the contention proposed. Levine (1995) quotes numerous studies, which have shown that viewing media violence “encourages aggression and desensitisation” but she also concluded that, a greater tolerance for or acceptance of violence is likely.
Passivity is not the same as resiliency – we do not hope to encourage passivity in individuals – rather we hope to assist them in the development of assertiveness and help-seeking skills (Healey 2001). Violence viewing more likely results in desensitisation to simulated violence – hence the desire to view more graphic depictions of simulated ‘violence’ at each sitting – but there is no evidence that watching simulated violence desensitises young people to real violence. It is apparent that the research undertaken has not been carefully analysed in term of differentiating real from simulated violence. Ideally viewers would all become desensitised to simulated violence to the extent that it becomes rejected as boring and repetitious. Even in this circumstance it is most unlikely that any individual seeing violence against another person or animal in real life would be unmoved. Research in South Africa seems to support this contention. Botha (1993) describes the responses of white and black youth to non-fictional examples of violence shown in the television media. White South Africans – for whom the violence was not a reality of their own lives – were unmoved or responded in a desensitised manner – as one would expect of someone observing fiction or simulation. Black youths on the other hand responded with anxiety during the viewing due to the closer reality with their own lives. Neither group reported feeling an urge to violence. Ageback (1997) agrees “evidence proving familiarisation with media violence leads to indifference towards violence in real life, is yet to be unveiled”.

Jean Healey
Australian & New Zealand Society of Criminology
Another common argument put forward regarding the impact of media viewing is that product advertisers can clearly demonstrate that their efforts lead to increases in the purchase and profile of their product and that therefore viewing can be highly influential and can dictate behaviour. However, it cannot be assumed that it is just as easy to influence individuals to engage in neutral behaviour (e.g., buying goods) as it is to influence them to engage in anti-social, violent or criminal behaviour. Unless preconditions are present, such as propensity for or training in violence, most people will not be influenced by media images which contravene all of their moral and social beliefs, to engage in the demonstrated behaviours. The mediating factors for most young people are their powerful moral and social, psychological and intellectual development and learning, most of which occurs long before violence viewing is experienced.

From the extensive literature available it is clear that the following statements can be substantiated:

- young people who already have a propensity for violence will choose violence viewing. The boys in the Lefkowitz (1977) study clearly preferred violence viewing and this correlated with assessments of their own already established levels of violence.

- these young people may supplement their repertoire of violent behaviour through violence viewing

- violent young people are more likely to become involved in criminal activity and are more likely to be arrested.
• the ‘reality factor’ in fact, increases sensitivity to violence – the more realistic the violence, the more fearful and distressed most young viewers become.

• young people who do not have a violent orientation or behaviours are most unlikely to copy violence viewed.

• most young people are effectively socialised, moral and discerning individuals who capably distinguish real from simulated violence and show no inclination toward violent behaviour.

Petrie (1994) explodes the media-influence theory in his review of the murder of James Bulger in the UK, and examines the concept of the ‘evil within’. Given the social and familial backgrounds of the two juvenile murderers, violence viewing probably played a negligible role. Indeed, Mathews (1994) contends that no connection with the child’s murder could be identified in a systematic examination by censors of the video “Chucky 3” which was widely believed to have influenced the boys. The anti-social, pro-violence attitudes portrayed in the video may have reinforced their own perceptions, but they did not create them. James Ferman of the British Board of Film Classification says “What has never been demonstrated is that media violence is either a necessary or sufficient cause of violence in real life”. (Videodrome 1994). There is no correlation between violence viewed and violent behaviour to prove causality.
Certainly in recent years there have been a number of mass murders committed by juveniles, particularly in the United States where access to means and access to victims combine with individual psychopathology and result in tragic young deaths. The overriding evidence in each of the murders, however, seems to indicate that the youthful felons were no more generally violent than any of their peers – weird, perhaps, unpopular usually and often rejected – but none were reportedly violent prior to the murders. These most violent of juvenile crimes do not seem to be in any way related to violence viewing. Nor can we demonstrate in these extreme cases that these juveniles were anymore likely than others to watch violence. The link that can be established, however, is that already violent individuals are likely to select violent videos. Violent individuals are also likely to engage in behaviour leading to criminal convictions.

Dee (1987) in a review of US court decisions related to cases in which a young person was the victim of violence found that courts were hesitant to suggest that media organisations were accountable for inciting violence. Chesney-Lind et al (1996) and Artz (1997) are concerned with the media images portrayed of violent adolescent girls, but agree that these young women may well have a similarly violent orientation to their male counterparts and are more like violent males than non-violent females, although they resist using biological determinism to account for similarities.
It is apparent that young people exposed to violence in their real lives are more likely to be involved in criminal activity and accumulate twice as many arrests as offenders who did not use violence. (Capaldi 1993) Spatz-Widom (1995. Violent offenders also came from family backgrounds where crime and violence were frequent also demonstrates links between familial violence and subsequent criminal and violent behaviour in children of such families. They, along with Salby (1997) advocate early intervention to avoid the long-term impact of violence in the lives of children. In Spatz–Widom’s, research 26% of juveniles identified as abused and neglected had been arrested and involved in criminal activity at a younger age.

Youth violence, popularly believed to be influenced if not caused by violence viewing is often reported in the print media is such a way as to suggest increases of crime–wave proportions. As Polk (1995) points out, youth involvement in violent crimes has been stable over the past ten years and in homicide the age group 0 – 19 years accounts for just 18% of offences. Nevertheless, it is disastrous that such young people should be involved in murder at all and community concerns reflects this. The most likely negative influences impacting on their involvement however, are alcohol consumption (Egger 1995), the ready availability of weapons such as knives and the presence of young people in unsupervised often public spaces in search of recreation (Polk 1997). The data relating to violent incidents involving young people are much more likely to show that they had recently exited a hotel than a cinema showing a violent movie.
Youth conflicts leading to violence are likely to be provoked by verbal interchanges which threaten their fragile self-concepts and newly emerging ‘masculinity’ given that such young offenders are most often male (Polk, op cit) and that their concept of masculinity is often poorly constructed. Young males are most at risk from each other in our society and this is related to social perceptions of what constitutes “a real man”. We need to establish a view that strength and masculinity are not compatible with violence towards others, particularly women and children – that violence can be resolved through education is a evident(Jenkin 1996) and is well supported by the evidence that the majority of young people do not engage in violence irrespective of their experiences via the family or media (Spatz – Widom op cit). In 1990-1991 16% of all homicide victims nationally were under the age of 19 (Strang 1992), with children under age one year disproportionately represented. Young victims and perpetrators of violence are usually involved as a result of a spontaneous and rapidly escalating dispute with no evidence of pre-meditation or systematic planning such as may be anticipated were they to use viewed violence as their reference and mentor. “Copy cat” crimes of violence are a print media invention with no evidence of such deliberations available in the crime statistics data.

One rather controversial recent proposition is that maleness is a cause of violence rather than simply a correlational factor (Eggar, 1995). Of concern to feminist analysts, certainly is the portrayal of women in submissive and victimised roles in the media and the consequent reinforcement of sexist attitudes.
It cannot be demonstrated, however, that such portrayals initiate pro-violent attitudes where none existed previous to viewing. Overall, the individual psychology rationale has greater credibility than any explanation focusing on an external locus of control. Katz (1988) while considering social and environmental factors in youth alienation focuses most strongly on moral and ethical motives as the driving forces in young people's involvement in crime and violence. Spatz Widom (op cit) also examines individual characteristics and capacities as possible 'buffers' against the long-term negative consequences of real life violent experiences – in fact most victims of familial violence do not engage in violence in later life. It is very apparent that a wide range of contingent factors must be present in violent individuals before violence is perpetrated and that violence viewing is, at most, incidental.

Overall, there can be no edifying reason for the creation, presentation and sale of violent media products to young people. Violence in all forms of media does not contribute to the appropriate socialisation of young people, does not represent reality nor, in fact offer any redeeming reasons for its own existence. Violent media images are unnecessary and intrusive, taking the place of works which could be more entertaining, more constructive and more valuable for the young people who view them. Media creators need to stop catering to the lowest common denominator of expectations; moral values, intellect and sophistication, and begins to produce media images that will live long in the memory for positive reasons. But they will not.
They know very well that violence on screen is profitable – and they care not that a vulnerable few may find the ideas presented instructive. Instead of concentrating time, energy and resources in researching and agitating for more responsible media products, society needs to focus on the major genesis of the violent individual – the home, the family and the influence they reflect.

Despite this concern for identifying and intervening in genuinely aggressive activity among young people, it is also apparent that there is a failure to identify potentially dangerous individuals. Martin Bryant, who was responsible for the massacre at Port Arthur, was reportedly a quiet though ‘strange’ and withdrawn student at school; recent juvenile mass murderers in USA have been variously described as ‘walking time bombs’ and ordinary kids; the murders of James Bulger in the UK were troubled children who nevertheless slipped through the net. Irrespective of the video viewing habits of such individuals it is unlikely their murderous behaviour was triggered in this way, and while violent behaviour during childhood may signal future problems, so can withdrawn, depressed and isolated demeanours. The personality and interaction styles of such individuals are far more indicative than their viewing habits.
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PEER ABUSE AS CHILD ABUSE AND INDICATIONS FOR INTERVENTION

IN SCHOOLS

JEAN B. HEALEY

ABSTRACT

Peer abuse in the form of bullying is now recognised as an endemic feature of school life and in terms of impact, outcomes and intervention requirements can be equated with other forms of child abuse. It is argued in the light of data presented here that the parallels between peer abuse and more generally accepted forms of child abuse must be recognised and addressed with some urgency. The paper discusses the types, frequency and intensity of bullying behaviour reported in high schools in NSW, clearly demonstrating that the behaviours which are currently reported as bullying behaviours are also abusive and equally harmful. There can be no doubt that peer abuse fits the common descriptors of child abuse across all reported criteria. However, it is evident that teachers currently often do not interpret the behaviours as either abusive or bullying, but as mutually aggressive interactions between peers, leaving victims unprotected and unsupported. It is suggested that implementation of legislative requirements for mandatory notification by teachers of all forms of abuse should be considered as a means of intervention and as a protective measure in severe cases of peer abuse. Further, employing bodies need to ensure teachers are aware of the relevance of all child protection procedures and requirements to the issue of peer abuse.
Teachers often do not interpret bullying behaviours as abusive but as mutually aggressive interactions between peers. It is a reasonable proposition however, that many such interactions between peers result from the domination of one child by another in unequal and abusive situations. There is a strong correlation between peer abuse and other forms of abuse in terms of the impact, outcomes and prevalence and in this regard it can be clearly demonstrated that peer abuse is child abuse. Further, in such cases where children are being consistently harmed or harassed by a peer, and reasonable grounds are established for abuse, the behaviour ought to be notified on the basis of the mandated procedures for protection. To date there has been a failure on the part of teachers to adequately assess the seriousness of the problem of peer abuse (Besag, 1989; Healey (a) 2001; Smith, 1994,) and this seems to indicate that it should be incorporated into the legal procedures and professional processes established for protection and include consultation with other professionals. Numerous acts of abuse against student have been reported which serve to illustrate the range and intensity of such behaviours in typical high school settings and which may warrant notification under the legislation.
Few researchers have addressed the issue of peer abuse in the context of child protection but in defining either peer abuse or the more commonly acknowledged abuse of children by adults the similarities are far more noteworthy than the differences.

DEFINING PEER ABUSE AS CHILD ABUSE

Not only are the actual behaviours often the same, there is ample evidence that peer abuse can have equally as serious and permanent repercussions as other forms of abuse (Ambert, 1998; Olweus, 1993; Portwood, 1999). Concepts of harm or threatened harm by acts or omissions which expose the child physically, emotionally or morally (Portwood 1999; Roscoe, 1990) are generally used to define abusive behaviours. The injury must be non-accidental and the concept of ‘intentionality’ is therefore paramount. Furthermore the acts must be observed to be inflicted, threatened or permitted to be threatened or inflicted (Hodges and Perry, 1996) and it is therefore clear that the abuse of children by their peers particularly when this is known to teachers, implicates these professionals in terms of child protection mandates. If child abuse can be defined as harmful acts which are perpetrated, tolerated or facilitated by adults, then peer abuse, which has been notified or observed but for which no intervention has been forthcoming, would certainly fit the category of abuse. Teachers can be considered responsible for both appropriate identification of the behaviours observed (as abusive or bullying) and for intervention.
Peer abuse may be perpetrated by age peers, by older social contacts such as the friends of older siblings (Ambert, 1998), or students in higher year levels at the same school (Healey, (a) 2001; Rigby and Slee, 1991). Children are generally vulnerable and have few choices about with whom they associate, particularly during the school day and travelling to and from school when bullying often occurs (Healey (a) 2001; Smith, 1994). Peer abuse is facilitated by both the restricted range of social contacts for young people, and by social structures which ensure that age peers spend the majority of their time together. Peer abuse is often differentiated from other forms of child abuse on the basis of the developmental and social status of the perpetrator, but not from other forms of aggressive interactions between peers which result from conflict. It is clear that peer abuse, as with other forms of abuse, depends upon a perceived difference in social status or power of the abuser compared to the victim, even though there may be no obvious power difference between the victim and their age-mate abuser. (Marsh, Parada, Yeung & Healey, 2001). In peer abuse the power does not reside necessarily in the physical size difference between the bully and victim, although some researchers have identified inferior physical development as a factor in bullying victimisation, (Olweus, 1993). Rather, it is perceived social position and status which bullies use to their advantage.
Bullies are described in surprisingly glowing terms by non-victimised peers as ‘popular, attractive’, having ‘lots of friends’ and being ‘cool and clever’, due to their often imposing physical presence and social skills. Victims, on the other hand are described as ‘unattractive, nerds, geeks,’ having ‘problems and spots’, & being ‘slow and friendless.’ (Healey, (a) 2001). Power is vested in the bully by admiring peers who mistake dominance for leadership as do teachers who observe the interpersonal interactions of such individuals. Socio-cultural theories which define power, are as applicable to the phenomenon of peer abuse as to the abusive interactions based on power, which characterise child abuse by adults. In the latter situation there is a clear social rank attributable to abusive adults which victims find difficult to resist, while with abusive peers’ status is attributed by other peers and is equally difficult to overcome.

Emotional abuse of children which impacts on their psychological functioning and well being includes: ‘acts of rejection’ (Rutter, 1993),’spurning, terrorizing, isolating, exploitation and denial of emotional responsivity (sic)’, (Hart and Brassard, 1991) and the repetitive, sustained nature of the abuse is a definitive feature (Kent and Waller, 1998). Bullying is similarly described as involving ‘repeated taunting’ (Munthe, 1989),’put downs, insults ,laughing and gesturing in derogatory ways’ (Ambert, 1998 ),’social exclusion and demeaning ’ (Roland, 1989).
All of these behaviours would be acknowledged as abusive if conducted by an adult against a child. Hodges and Perry (1996) confirm that peer abuse has the effect of causing depression, low self esteem and avoidance of school, while Olweus (1993) also found elevated levels of depressive tendencies and poor self esteem which continued into young adulthood. Physical peer abuse can lead to suicide (Tatum, 1993) and hospitalisation or permanent damage at its worst and the development of fear, anxiety or withdrawal in victims (Healey 2001 (c)),

Psychopathology and future criminal behaviour are also implicated in both peer abuse and child abuse paradigms whether in reference to the prognosis for the victim or the perpetrator (Kent and Waller, 1998; Oates 1989; Spatz-Widom, 1996; ) and the confluence of symptoms and outcomes becomes more evident as the issues are examined further.

Ambert (1995) suggests that peer abuse is seen to differ from other forms of abuse on three key factors: the age of the perpetrator, formal power distinctions and neglect, which she believes are the factors which are generally used to diminish the impact of the behaviour. Since minors undertake the abuse, the abuse is therefore minor, since there is no recognised power differential there can be no abusive relationship and peers are not responsible for their age mates so therefore neglect cannot be attributed to them. As she notes, it is apparent that these arguments are fast losing their credibility as the impact of peer abuse is documented and the legal responsibilities of teachers and other carers is challenged.
Barnett, Manly and Cicchetti (1993) delineate six dimensions on which child abuse can be identified and analysed comprising: type of abuse, severity, frequency, developmental stage interventions and perpetrators. Peer abuse can be measured and analysed on each of these dimensions providing a comprehensive picture of its similar aetiology to other forms of child abuse. Peer abuse corresponds with child abuse across types, severity and impact as the data here demonstrate. Teachers therefore, who are aware of abusive peers but who do not follow mandated procedures for the reporting of the behaviour may well be in breach of the legal and professional guidelines under which they are employed.

The capacity of peers to abuse their age mates is not questioned, rather it is the failure to interpret this behaviour as abusive and the subsequent responses of teachers in terms of their mandated responsibilities to report the abuse, which is examined here. While it is self evident in reviews of the current literature regarding child abuse, that peer abuse or bullying unquestionably fits the definitions, there still seems to be some doubt about the application of the mandated legal processes and professional requirements to report abuse.

Logistically, because of the prevalence of the behaviours as demonstrated in this study, it may not be possible to offer the same level of protection to all abused individuals under the terms of the legislation.

Realistically also, all abused individuals may not require the level of protective intervention afforded through the processes prescribed, and it can be anticipated that for students with some measure of resiliency (Carver, 1998; Healey, 2001; Kinard, 1998) such support may not be necessary. English (1998) also cautions about the demands placed on child protection agencies and the need to ration their involvement, a consideration which is likely to be compounded by the inclusion of peer abuse as a category of abuse. Other researchers suggest the responsibility for intervention in child protection, though not specifically peer abuse, may need to be spread into the community (Munro, 1998; Schene, 1998; Waldfogel, 1998) rather than simply relying on agency supports. Anti-bullying interventions in many countries, in particular the Scandinavian sector, have produced advertising campaigns, systems - wide programs and specific legislation to prevent peer abuse (Smith, 1994) with documented success, but such approaches are yet to be tried in Australia.

In an attempt to illustrate the prevalence of abusive peer behaviours the following data are presented from four NSW metropolitan high schools. Overall, 18.8% of the whole student population reported peer abuse on a weekly, daily or more frequent basis. This is a significant proportion of individuals being consistently exposed to abusive verbal, physical and social interactions which are damaging and inappropriate.
The most prevalent behaviours were verbally abusive interactions (name calling, teasing) receiving comments about appearance and cultural origins and physically abusive behaviour including being hit, kicked and punched. In terms of documented child abuse the behaviours reported here were highly correlated in terms of the frequency, intensity and impact.

METHOD

The data presented here are from a larger study conducted during 1999-2001 in four NSW high schools which sought assistance in identifying instances of peer victimisation on campus. A survey questionnaire was distributed to 3287 students at the schools, and the data were analysed using SPSS (version 9). The survey comprised ten questions yielding data related to background demographics of the population such as year level of attendance, country of birth of the student and gender, as well as a range of items requesting factual or opinion-based responses in relation to safety issues and experiences for respondents. Responses presented for this discussion related to question four which described eight different types of bullying behaviours and asked specifically, 'have any of the following behaviours ever happened to you at this school?'. Responses were recorded across a range of five intensity variables (never, occasionally, weekly, daily, more often).
In line with current definitions of peer abuse which prescribe the frequency of the behaviour as a critical defining factor (Rigby, 1996; Smith, 1994) students responding ‘never’ or ‘occasionally’ were not considered to have been victimised, and were therefore not included in the population identified as bullied. The data thus derived identified the proportion of students abused regularly as 618 (18.8%).

RESULTS

Results are presented in Tables 1-4

Table 1 describes the overall distribution of the population by gender and shows that the majority of students surveyed were females as more girls-only schools requested the service. Males comprised 27.4% of the surveyed population (902) and females 72.5% (2384). This information becomes more relevant when results are examined for rates, intensity and types of peer abuse reported.

Table 2 represents students identified by their responses as being bullied. These 618 students (18.8% of the total population surveyed) comprise 44% male and 56% female. Obviously males therefore are over represented in the population of bullied students.
Table 3 records the percentage of males and females in the total population of the survey who reported being bullied by each of eight types of behaviour. It is apparent that not only is the range of behaviours broad, covering physical, verbal and emotional abuse, but that significant numbers of students are reporting the behaviours occurring on a weekly daily or more frequent basis.

For male students 19.4% of the overall population reported bullying by name-calling and teasing 13.5% reported receiving comments about their appearance and another 14% threats or comments about their family, country of origin or religion.

In all 46.9% of males surveyed complain of some form of verbal abuse on a regular basis in school. A further 10.1% reported physical abuse in the form of being hit, punched or kicked, 6.4% report extortion or property damage and 5.9% exclusion as a form of abuse.

For female students the situation is less bleak though still significant, with 19.1% reporting verbal abuse in terms of comments and threats, which is less than half that of males students while 2.3% report physical bullying and 3.7% are excluded.

Overall, males are significantly more likely to be abused by peers across eight identified categories of behaviour and are up to five times more likely to endure abuse in some categories.
Table 4 illustrates the percentage of each type of behaviour experienced by males and females and shows that males are over-represented in terms of reported instances of abusive behaviour, since males represent only 27% of those surveyed, yet between 37.2% and 62.5% of all reported instances. Males experienced 62.5% of all physical bullying, 61.8% of all reported threats, 54.3% of all verbal abuse related to origins. Females represented 62.6% of those students reporting exclusion and 62.8% of those forced to give goods or belongings.

All behaviours except ‘force’ were significantly correlated with gender. Kendalls’ tau was significant at the 0.01% level (two tailed) for all abuse types except ‘force’.

Spearman’s rho was significant at the 0.01 % level (two -tailed) for all abuse types except ‘force’.

The implications are therefore that intervention to include peer abuse as a child protection matter will offer more protections to young males than current child protection interventions since most such notifications involve females. It may well be that abuse of males has been under-reported and consequently not addressed as peer - abusers have not been recognised as such.
LEGAL, PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES

Legislation which mandates the reporting of suspected abuse of children does not discriminate on the basis of the presence, level or type of professional qualifications of the individual concerned with the report. Procedures are standardised for all those in contact with the abused child, irrespective of their perceived or documented professional status. Indicators of childhood abuse are rarely overt enough to warrant immediate intervention by teachers and it is generally expected and prescribed in both the legislation and the professional guidelines for reporting that some time may elapse during which observations of the child may lead to a suspicion that abuse is occurring. In the case of peer abuse the problem is a little different as these behaviours may well be overt and even frequently observed—the difference is in the interpretation of the behaviours as mutual conflict rather than abuse. There is some corruption of teacher—interpretations of the behaviour as their frequent contact with children who are often in genuine reciprocal conflict can predetermine their interpretation of the abusive behaviours.

The intimate knowledge teachers have of the interpersonal idiosyncrasies of the children in their care should provide them with some means to differentiate conflict and abuse. For example, children who are not generally—speaking aggressive but whom seem to be “involved” in frequent altercations should probably be identified as victims particularly if they are often injured.
Hurst v DET (Healey 2000(c)) was a case in point whereby the victim was not offered protection from his abusers as teachers continually misinterpreted his injuries as resulting from 'fights' even though school reports consistently identified him as a non-confrontational and passive individual.

The issue then is for improved teacher preparation in the area of peer abuse so that behaviours which are obviously abusive can be isolated from consensual conflict and appropriately dealt with. Professional discretion is certainly permissible in the direction of protection, and given that teachers, are more likely to witness this type of child abuse than other forms which occur outside school boundaries and hours their ability to recognise the indicators is a critical factor. If current definitions of bullying are known to the observer: the lack of reciprocity, intention to harm, repeated nature of the actions and obvious distress ensuing (Besag, 1989; Tattum, 1993) there would be no dilemma in addressing the behaviour as abusive and it is not unreasonable to expect such an interpretation despite the social or developmental status of the perpetrators. Name calling, taunting and overt rejection of individual children would readily be interpreted as abusive if inflicted by an adult within the hearing and observation of the teacher, and it is suggested here that no other evidence is needed of abuse when such behaviours are observed in peers towards an individual.
Finally, concerns for the disruption to family and social group cohesion precipitated by notification of abuse have been expressed (Heatherton and Beardsall, 1998; Sheerin , 1998;). While the welfare of the victim is held to be paramount, the individual functions within a complex social milieu throughout which the ripple effect of notification can have very damaging effect. Teachers are concerned to maintain close bonds between peers in the belief that this scaffolds future relationships. Currently it is most unlikely that a safe environment will be provided for the abused child other than temporarily, by removal of the peer abuse perpetrator such as in a school suspension.

The time has come to place peer abuse firmly within the child protection framework, giving access to all of the legislative provisions which are afforded other types of child abuse. It is not difficult to establish the correlation between bullying and other forms of abuse in terms of the behaviours, their impact and outcomes. By combining the literature relating to bullying behaviour and that describing other behaviours traditionally viewed as abusive, a strong case can be made for peer abuse as child abuse. In terms of the perceived impact outcomes and support requirements necessary for the protection of children and young persons from long term damage as a result of abuse, the provisions of the legislation and the procedures and requirements delineated by teacher employing bodies are clearly applicable to severe peer abuse and should now be implemented as a protective intervention.
In terms of this discussion it is suggested that the application of the same
guidelines proposed for the notification of all forms of suspected or
identified child abuse be applied in instances of peer abuse.
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Statistics

gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1. GENDER OF STUDENTS IN STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3287</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: BULLIED STUDENTS BY GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tease</td>
<td>comment</td>
<td>threats</td>
<td>appear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males N=902</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>7.80%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females N=2384</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3: GENDER BY TYPES OF PEER ABUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tease</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>threats</th>
<th>appear</th>
<th>exclude</th>
<th>hit</th>
<th>force</th>
<th>damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td>54.30%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
<td>40.70%</td>
<td>37.40%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td>43.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>51.30%</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
<td>38.20%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>62.80%</td>
<td>56.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4: STUDENTS ABUSED BY THIS TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR % BY GENDER**

**KEY:**

- TEASE= bullied by being teased or called names
- COMMENT= bullied by comments about your family
country of birth or religion
- THREATS= bullied by threats to safety
- APPEAR. = bullied by comments about your appearance
- EXCLUDE= bullied by being left out on purpose
- HIT= bullied by being hit, punched, kicked
- FORCE= bullied by being forced to give money or belongings
- DAMAGE= bullied by damage to personal property
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ABSTRACT

Bullying is now recognised as an endemic feature of school life and efforts are being made to address the issue comprehensively through policy and curriculum development as well as individual interventions. The ethical and moral issues involved in determining the responses to bullying have been significantly challenged by new legislation and it is timely to consider bullying as a child protection issue for schools given the well documented long-term impact of the behaviour. The proclamation in June 2000 of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 in NSW mandates early notification of all forms of abuse and increases both the level of responsibility and liability for litigation of teachers and schools for failure to offer the appropriate level of protection to victims. It is suggested here that peer abuse fits the definitions and applications of this process. Teachers are in close proximity to the bully-victim paradigm and the recent review of legislation implicates them in intervention at the level of legal as well as moral and ethical responsibility.
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PEER ABUSE AS A LEGISLATED CHILD PROTECTION ISSUE FOR SCHOOLS

ABSTRACT

The ethical and professional issues involved in determining responses to peer abuse have been significantly challenged by new legislation and it is timely to consider such abuse as a child protection issue for schools given the well-documented long-term impact of the behaviour. The proclamation in December 2000 of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 in NSW, mandates early notification of all forms of abuse, and increases both the level of responsibility and liability for litigation of teachers and schools for failure to offer an appropriate level of protection to victims. A case study is discussed describing recent litigation against the Department of Education and Training in NSW which serves to illustrate that severe peer abuse fits the definitions and applications of the Act. It is suggested that early invocation of the process prescribed may help avoid such litigation in future but more importantly could provide protection for victims of serious peer abuse.1
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Despite this, here is little research or evidence that peer abuse is recognised as a form of child abuse nor that legal provisions are used in this way to protect children. In the USA, where legal mandates exist in all states with punitive sanctions including fines and imprisonment applicable for failure to notify, (Kampulainen et al 1998), in Hong Kong (Liau, Liu, Yu & Wong 1999); Egypt, (Youssef, Attila & Kamel 1996) and the UK (Smith, 1994) there is an apparent reluctance to notify all forms of child abuse and peer abuse is not considered for notification under the auspices of child protection. Under-reporting of all forms of abuse is an international phenomenon notwithstanding mandatory procedures present in most western nations (King, Reece, Bendel and Patel, 1998; O'Toole, Webster, O'Toole and Lual 1999). Despite a fourfold increase in the rate of reporting between 1976 and 1995 (King et al op cit; Zellman and Faller 1996), this represents far fewer cases than researchers believe are notifiable (Finkelhor and Hotaling, 1984; Tilden, Schmidt, Limandri, Chiodo, Gariandm & Loveless 1994). In New Zealand mandatory reporting has only recently been legislated and there is no legal obligation to report any form of peer abuse. Common arguments against its introduction included a lack of evidence of increased prosecutions as a result of notification and investigation. This is an issue which has been resolved in other locations as indicative of inadequate legal processes for prosecution rather than inaccurate assessments of children’s safety. Despite a rise in the rate of child deaths there from .68 in 100,000 in 1983 to 1.23 in 1993, it seems unlikely that peer abuse would be considered for notification when such severe adult abuse was not reported under the Children and their Families (Child Protection) Act 1989. Nevertheless, New Zealand could lead the world in including peer abuse in child protection legislation when this act is reviewed following current community debate.
PEER ABUSE AS A LEGISLATED CHILD PROTECTION ISSUE FOR SCHOOLS

Child abuse issues have been afforded a high profile in NSW schools in the wake of the Wood Royal Commission which eventually spread a net widely enough to implicate a number of teachers in child abuse matters and prosecution for failure to notify suspected cases of abuse of children and young people in their care. A review of the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 led to the declaration of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act NSW 1998-which extended the legal obligations of mandatory notification to a much broader range of professionals working with children including, for the first time, early childhood educators. The focus of the Act, proclaimed in December 2000, is the provision and maintenance of protective services to children in abusive situations and an emphasis on preventative intervention in suspected cases. In 1997 in NSW the then Department of School Education instituted a review of procedures extending regulations previously applying only to sexual abuse notification, to require that all suspected or reported forms of abuse of children and young people be appropriately notified. Retraining of all in-service teachers was undertaken during 1998 and a commitment made to ensuring the suitability of candidates for teaching and employment, using the Prohibited Persons Register introduced prior to the reviewed Act. Changes to the processes for identifying abusive colleagues, as well as children and young people experiencing abuse inside or outside the education system, were put in place and teachers left with no doubt that inappropriate interactions with students and failure to protect them from the same, would have serious legal implications.
Factors reviewed here in relation to the issue of child protection in peer relationships include the frequency and efficacy of applications of legislative and employing body requirements for mandatory notification to the specific form of abuse known as bullying or peer abuse; and the professional, legal and ethical issues in the use of the current provisions to counteract this form of abuse.

**Mandatory Notification of Suspected Child Abuse-Does Peer Abuse fit the Criteria?**

Child abuse is defined similarly in Australia and overseas and recurring themes related to the impact, outcomes and prevalence of abuse indicate close correlations with peer abuse in determining whether these behaviours fit the category (Healey 2001c, Roscoe 1990). In terms of the types of behaviours endured, their intensity, frequency and psychological impact, peer abuse can be shown to parallel other forms of abuse (Amber, 1998; Portwood, 1999) which are more usually notified under child protection legislation. The non-accidental nature of the injury, the power relationships between the victim and the perpetrator, although not as obvious between ‘peers’, and the harm or threatened harm which characterises peer victimisation equates to child abuse on all levels of analysis. Further, peer abuse is often known to teachers, though rarely identified as abusive, and this implicates teachers in terms of child protection mandates. Schene (1998) suggests that the protection of children has been established historically as a government function and, it is argued here, that since more children may be at risk from their peers than abusive adults, protection must now be extended to include peer abuse as a legislated child protection issue. Where there are “ongoing concerns for the safety, welfare & wellbeing of the child or young person” as a result of known or suspected abuse, the teacher is mandated to report. This criterion is patently relevant to peer - abusive situations of which the teacher becomes aware.
PEER ABUSE AS A CHILD PROTECTION ISSUE

For the issue of peer abuse data are not generally available relating to reporting and legal interventions under child protection provisions, since the phenomenon has not yet been acknowledged nor recorded in the abuse statistics.

In Australia, most states and territories mandate reporting of child abuse on the basis of 'reasonable grounds to suspect' that abuse is occurring and the legislation therefore should be applied in the case of severe peer abuse.

The NSW Act (1998) states:

'that all institutions responsible for the care and protection of children and young people provide an environment for them that is free of violence and exploitation and provide services that foster their health, developmental needs and dignity'

(chapter 2, article 8 a,b)

Chapter two of the Act (part 9,a & d) states that the principles to be applied in the administration of the Act are as follows:

"in all actions and decisions made under this act, (whether by legal or administrative process) concerning a particular child or young person, the safety, welfare and well-being of the child or young person must be the paramount consideration"

In terms of decision-making with regard to reporting peer abuse therefore, teachers are mandated to consider these aspects of the child's situation.

In chapter 3(23) the risk of harm definition states that a child or young person is at risk of harm

"if current concerns exist for the safety, welfare or well-being of the child or young person"

because of the presence of such circumstances as:
"the child or young person's basic physical or psychological needs are not being met or are at risk of not being met"

and

"the child or young person has been, or is at risk of being physically or sexually abused or ill-treated"

The specific obligation to notify under the mandatory notification provisions (part 27 of the Act) further states that:

"(a) a person to whom this section applies has reasonable grounds to suspect that a child is at risk of harm ... and (b) those grounds arise during the course of or from the person's work,"

must make a report as soon as practicable. It is clear that these mandates cannot be ignored in the case of severe peer abuse when the criteria for risk and harm are met and documented. Bearing in mind that definitions of bullying refer to an ongoing abusive process not a single incident of assault for example, peer abuse fits the criteria for sustained and current concerns for welfare & safety.

Since the NSW Act mandates that any persons listed, including teachers, must report the concern as soon as practicable there seems to be no reason to exclude the abusive behaviours of peers from this directive. While the onus of proof in these circumstances is irrelevant to notification, in the case of peer abuse, teachers often do have extensive documentation, formal and informal observations of abusive interactions whereby individual children have been exposed to harm by their peers.

Teachers are protected in the NSW legislation by not being required to make a determination about the seriousness of the abuse they suspect is occurring.
Therefore the use of the mandated provisions in the case of peer abuse may well help prevent legal proceedings being taken against schools and teachers who are seen to have failed to protect their students from peer abuse, or to have misinterpreted the behaviour.

South Australian legislation uses phraseology which could also readily be applied to cases of peer abuse in that intervention can be undertaken when:

'\textit{there is some information or evidence leading to a reasonable suspicion that a child is at risk}'

'\textit{that the child is in a situation such that.....the child’s safety would be in serious danger}'

and

'\textit{that the child is not in the company of any of his or her guardians}'

(Children’s Protection Act 1993 Section 20 South Australian Consolidated Acts)

In the Tasmanian Child Protection Act 1974, it is stated that ‘\textit{any person is entitled to report the fact ‘(Section 8) of maltreatment on the basis of reasonable grounds to suspect that it is occurring. In Queensland, voluntary reporting has only recently been replaced with legal mandates, and the reporting of abuse is on the increase. Peer abuse is not yet considered notifiable under this legislation.

In Victoria, however, the legal requirement relates only to sexual and physical abuse and states that the professional must report the abuse only when they have ‘formed the belief on reasonable grounds’ that abuse is happening. This permits an element of judgement or discretion enabling the observer to opt out of reporting if they claim not to believe the indicators presented, including disclosure (Swain 1998).

One case has been heard under these guidelines and although the child was subsequently found to have been abused the prosecution for non-reporting was unsuccessful because it could not be shown that a belief was formed.
In this situation, peer abuse is far less likely to be viewed as a child protection issue. Given the long term impact, children and young people are entitled to the same rights to protection under the law as adults in abusive situations. Conflict resolution is a most inappropriate method for dealing with either abusive adult or peer relationships (Healey 2001(c)) and legal provisions ensuring personal safety must be extended to young people who are at risk from peer abuse. In terms of this discussion it is suggested that the application of the same guidelines proposed for the notification of all forms of suspected or identified child abuse be applied in instances of severe ongoing peer abuse.

Teachers and others are being asked to do no more with regard to this crime than all community members are expected to do in relation to any suspected crime - that is to report their suspicions to those with the authority and expertise to investigate. An examination of the recent NSW legislation, and the similar processes mandated in other states, territories and countries, clearly prescribes the responsibility of professionals involved in children's services of any description as protective.

The definitions of abuse incorporated into the child protection legislation are broad enough that any harmful act towards a child or young person may be included, and they are therefore applicable to peer abuse. Sheerin (1998) discusses adolescent peer sexual abusers and the possibility of using the Irish Child Care Act to address their remedial needs as well as those of their victims. Specifically, the Acts generally define both children and young people by age (child as a person under the age of 16 years and young person as between 16 and 18 years) which permits application at both the high school and primary school levels. Peer abuse is well documented at both systems levels (Rigby & Slee, 1993, Healey 2001(a)) Knowledge of systematic, frequent and harmful abusive behaviour by peers unquestionably implicates teachers in notification under these guidelines.
Teachers who are aware of the abusive behaviour of children and young people but who do not follow mandated guidelines for the reporting of the behaviour may well be in breach of the legal and professional mandates under which they are employed. Fundamental to the concept of ‘professionalism’ are notions of specialised knowledge, ethical standards and practice and autonomy. In acquiring professional qualifications and recognition practitioners across all fields have the expectation that the judgements and decisions they make under these auspices have been pre-validated. The ethics and standards proclamations of a variety of professions involved in child protection delineate strict expectations for the maintenance of privacy, and adherence to protective organisational procedures. These have been devised to ensure that within this framework the decisions taken will be legitimate, have positive outcomes for clients, and not to be unnecessarily restrictive.

For some individuals, however, mandatory notification poses a significant challenge to their professional self-regard and indeed evidence is emerging that the removal of discretionary reporting has resulted in under-reporting (O’Toole et al., 1999). A number of factors contribute to the disinclination of mandated reporters to follow legislated and professional guidelines for suspected child abuse and further factors are insinuated when peer abuse is included in the abuse spectrum. These factors include definitional variations and parameters. In particular, there may be resistance to and exclusion of indicators of abuse based on misinterpretations of the behaviours as something other than abuse such as ‘fighting’ or mutual conflict. Teachers need professional preparation in differentiating reciprocal conflict from abuse (O’Moore 2000, Healey 2002(d)).
However, with minimal professional preparation in the recognition of either broadly defined child abuse, specifically defined peer abuse, (O’Moore 2000, Watts, 1994) or the relevant legislated mandates, teachers in particular, but doctors, lawyers, counsellors and other professionals may also feel they have no option but to rely on their professional discretion to determine whether there has been abuse. Obviously then with peer abuse, the main problem is raising the consciousness of teachers to the point where abuse is suspected in instances which may not previously have led to this conclusion, in particular in relation to peer interactions. There is also indecision about the level of seriousness of the abuse and varied beliefs and experience related to the impact and outcomes of reporting, especially if fellow professionals are implicated.

There are sociological concerns for the dichotomy of protection for the child versus family and social group cohesion, and the dilemma of removal of the child from the abusive situation versus in situ support and remediation for all concerned including perpetrators. (Sheerin, op cit)

Peer abuse has been the subject of legal action in Australia and overseas, although not through child protection provisions. Generally, private litigation for neglect of duty is sought when parents and individual students believe they have been poorly served in terms of safety and protection at school. Increasingly, reference is made to children’s rights to protection from harm freedom of association, adequate educational and safety provisions when issues of peer abuse arise. Legal intervention is considered, usually, only when the school system is deemed to have failed to provide adequate protection.
Reluctance to become involved may stem from an inaccurate understanding by teachers of their legal responsibilities for child protection and in particular their resistance to defining peer abuse as either serious or abusive or related to child protection. Protections under the law for reporting according to mandated provisions will hopefully assist in the acceptance of peer abuse as a phenomenon requiring serious professional attention and early intervention in the context of legislated child abuse provisions.

**Case Study of Severe Peer Abuse.**

A recent case argued in the District Court of Parramatta in NSW reinforces the necessity to apply the legislation in cases of severe peer victimisation in schools and should alert teachers to the need to be cognisant of their responsibilities in this regard.

In NSW, a particular case argued through private litigation illustrated the extreme impact of abusive peer behaviour and should act as a cautionary indicator to professionals and the community of the legal responsibilities of teachers witnessing or being aware of bullying. The case of Hurst v DET serves to illustrate the failure of the pre-1998 child protection legislative provisions to offer protection from ongoing and severe abuse perpetrated by peers. Considered within the framework of a discussion of the philosophical, ethical and legal issues pertinent to current child protection legislative provisions, this case is a pertinent example of an abusive situation in which the new Act could be applied.

In their recent action against the NSW Department of Education and Training (Hurst v DET, 2000; Healey 2000 (b)), evidence was tendered that the victim had been severely abused by peers on numerous occasions often resulting in serious physical harm. This student was systematically physically and psychologically abused throughout his high school education and as a result had developed severe anxiety, depression and migraine headaches.
Incidents included being thrown against a wall causing concussion, having garbage forced into his mouth, being pushed to the ground, punched and kicked and being persistently verbally abused. He suffered concussion on three separate occasions each of which incidents resulted in hospitalisation. He had a seizure at school following one such incident. He became withdrawn and depressed, his academic progress deteriorated and he eventually found it necessary to leave school (Frank, 2000).

Records provided by DET indicate that while ‘bullying’ was suspected the incidents were invariably interpreted as ‘fighting’ and described as such in critical incident reports completed by teachers. Despite consistent statements in annual school reports that the victim was a compliant and quiet student with a minor speech impediment, unlikely to involve himself in physical altercations, teachers failed to identify the acts as abusive. This was despite the fact that they clearly fitted current definitions of bullying in that they were ongoing, frequent intentionally harmful and non-reciprocal (Healey 2001). The error of interpretation was in seeing each of the incidents as a separate assault rather than as an ongoing and systematic process of peer abuse.

The same criteria are not usually applied in the case of child abuse by adults were a record of incidents would become a cumulative indicator of abuse and would be unlikely to be viewed as unrelated. The unfortunate litany of events for this individual may well have been interrupted had the current legislation been available and had teachers had available to them legislative supports such that severe cases of peer abuse could warrant notification under the child protection legislation.

As the 1998 Act is currently documented, the victim could be supported for investigation and intervention in the categories of physical and emotional abuse by peers, which may have precluded the eventual successful private litigation against DET.
As it stands, schools which notify peer abuse for investigation by statutory authorities under the new legislation will be viewed as responsibly undertaking their duty of care and will surely be less likely to be open to charges of neglect.

A whole school comprehensive intervention comprising the key components: data collection, policy development, staff training, organisational adaptations and generic and individual interventions (Healey 2002) is obviously the preferred option for management of peer abuse. However in severe cases this mechanism may be inadequate to ensure protection.

Intervention should be predicated on the impact and seriousness of the abuse, and the use of legislated processes may be warranted. It is not suggested that every incident of peer abuse can be addressed using the legislation. A socially and economically rational approach dictates that some means of differentiation be established by which to measure the relative impact and outcomes for individuals and by which to allocate a share of the intensive interventions and support available through these processes to the problem of peer abuse. Nevertheless, the legislation devised for child protection in NSW establishes as system of interagency supports which should be utilised to protect children and young people from peer abuse as well other sources of abuse. The developmental profile of the abuser should not preclude activation of protective processes for victims. The Act does not refer specifically or exclusively to abusive adult behaviour.

Other countries have enacted specific legislation against bullying which can lead to prosecution of the perpetrators (Bjorkvist and Osterman 1999; Haratchi, Catalano & Hawkins 1999; Morita, Harud, Haruo & Taki 1999). Such legal provisions may act as a deterrent assuming the peer abuser is aware of their existence, however this approach is less likely to offer immediate or practical protection to the victim within the school system and does not negate litigation against schools.
The introduction of specific anti-bullying legislation therefore, unless presented as a mandatory notification procedure would not improve the current situation in Australia since teachers could only be in a position to advise parents and victims of their right to litigate under those provisions, given that they identify behaviours as peer abuse. This cannot increase the protection offered the victim within the school setting and is merely punitive in nature, whereas the use of child protection interventions should provide an avenue for remediation of inadequate behaviours in bullies and victims.

It can also enable the teacher to continue a supportive educative roll free of the threat of litigation. In other words the new legislation can be utilised by teachers for their own protection as well as for the well being of victims of peer abuse.

Beliefs and experience relating to the impact and outcomes of reporting also pose an ethical dilemma for teachers. In invoking the child protection procedures, teachers are concerned at the repercussions for all parties - the abused child, the alleged perpetrator and themselves as reporters. Irrespective of the fact that mandated processes preclude such considerations and guarantee anonymity and protection from prosecution, O'Toole et al (1999), report that professionals including teachers doubt the efficacy of reporting, judge the effectiveness of agency interventions as poor and fear legal action. However, they seem to overlook the possibility of litigation against themselves for failure to report abuse.

It is suggested here that the current legislation provides the best means of protection and intervention for teachers, since it can be invoked at the school level and provide immediate notification. Child protection legislation therefore provides a more direct and effective pathway for protection.
However an examination of the use and effectiveness of the child protection legislation indicates that although peer abuse qualifies on all counts as notifiable under the legislation, invocation of the relevant act has thus far been noticeably absent.

A range of ethical and professional issues can be identified as discouraging the use of the legislation for this purpose, yet it must be noted that reticence to offer this form of protection to children who are abused by peers is professionally questionable.

A case can be made for the inclusion of peer abuse under the auspices of child protection legislation in order to provide appropriate and immediate intervention for victims and professional protections for teachers, but further professional preparation is necessary to ensure implementation as well as a genuine commitment to the reduction of peer abuse in school settings. Given that relevant, behaviour-specific and community endorsed provisions already exist for the protection of children and young people from abuse, the proposal that this should be applied in the case of peer abuse should not be too challenging. The protection and safety of students in relation to their peers must be paramount and legally supported.
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CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN RESILIENCE TO BULLYING IN GIRLS IN NSW HIGH SCHOOLS

JEAN B. HEALEY

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

In recent years, bullying in schools has become a major international focus of research and concern (Rigby & Slee 1991; Besag 1989; Pepler 1993; Bjorkqvist, 1994). During this time definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, differentiating bullying behaviour from violence, fighting, play and general conflict on a number of critical dimensions:

*reciprocity*-bullying involves the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who is not aggressive in return. The lack of reciprocity differentiates bullying from fighting and conflict (Jenkin 1993; Besag 1990).

*repetition*-bullying involves more than one event often occurring as a pattern of hurtful behaviour over a period of time, which differentiates it from episodic violence or assault(Olweus 1991; Smith 1999).

*intentionality*-the purpose of bullying is to harm the recipient.

Intentionality must be examined in relation to the claimed intention of the bully(often diminishing the purpose), the actual impact on the victim and the congruence of the two. If the victim is hurt, the victim is bullied.(Quine 1999)

power-there is an unmistakable power differential between the bully and victim, which does not always correlate with the size, age or social status of the bully or victim. Effective bullies may be smaller, younger or less socially powerful than the victim-their power being based in their propensity to engage in threatening anti-social behaviour. Nevertheless, bullies are also described in positive social terms relating to their physical appearance & status (Healey, 2001)

Psychologically, victims of bullying suffer from the effects long after the acts are over, resulting in withdrawal, depression and adjustment problems often throughout life. Victims behave as abandoned, anxious, cautious and mistrustful individuals which behaviours may have precipitated the bullying to start with, (Olweus 1991). It is quite clear that bullies are much more likely to select targets whose self-esteem is apparently low, and who therefore can be relied upon to view the bullying behaviour as their fault, and be reluctant to report it. On the matter of reporting, too, the Australian cultural tradition of not ‘dobbing’ can be held partly responsible for the lack of support victims receive. Teachers often interpret legitimate reporting of inappropriate behaviours as insignificant ‘tattling’ or in Australian ‘dobbing’- leaving the victim without a reliable system to resist or combat the victimisation they endure.

Contradictory findings have resulted from research into the physical features of those who are victims of bullying, but even in the earliest years of childhood, the bully and victim can be identified.
Children who are ‘different’ in appearance (due to disability, ethnicity or even fashion) can be singled out for adverse attention (Randall, 1991). Some researchers discuss the disadvantage of perceived physical weakness as a factor in the bullying of boys (Olweus, 1980), but this is much less an issue for girls, for whom physical attractiveness is a much more salient condition (Byrne, op cit; Bjorkovist, 1982). Hess (1998) suggests that “boy bullies are popular, girl bullies are not”, however the data gathered for this project indicate that female bullies are often described as those individuals who are popular, attractive and socially of high standing. Victims, on the other hand, were often described in derogatory terms with particular reference to weight, (fatness), unfashionableness in terms of hair or clothing and generally unacceptable “standards” of “coolness”. They were seen in a somewhat unsympathetic light particularly by older respondents. This data reinforces the notion that bullies are socially competent and dominant (Rigby, 1997) and that in terms of appropriate intervention, bullies require empathy training not social skills and self-esteem support, while victims would benefit from assistance with the development of resiliency and assertiveness (Jenkin, 1995, Besag, op cit).

A further salient feature of this study is that all respondents were female. The literature relating to female bullying compared to male bullying identifies differences in the types, rates and intensity of the behaviour. standing.
Indirect or covert forms of bullying such as exclusion, spreading rumours and undermining status are most likely to be evident in the bullying of and by females (Artz 1997; Pepler 1995; Bjorkqvist and Niemela, 1992). Finally, interest in the bullying of culturally different students arose partly as a result of a perceived rise in the level of anti-Asian sentiment in Australia in the wake of publicity about an emerging or apparent anti-immigration philosophy. Could it be that such attitudes would be adopted by young people and used as an excuse to initiate victimisation of peers who were evidently of ‘foreign’ origins?

PREVALENCE

A surprising degree of consistency is evident in the international literature relating to bullying in high schools with an overall 10-13% of students reporting involvement as either a bully or victim. (Rigby & Slee op cit, Sharp and Smith 1991; Byrne 1993). Bullying is also reported to peak during the early years of high school, gradually diminishing as students develop a more mature sense of empathy and a willingness to support those being victimised (Slee 1993; Rigby and Slee 1990). Racially-based bullying is rarely reported in the literature as such, but is often referred to as harassment or discrimination. Provided the behaviour described satisfy the criteria established for bullying, the terms may be interchangeable.
The literature is sparse for bullied students outside their own countries, but researchers discussing the level of bullying of immigrant students in foreign countries examine such phenomena as the impact on self-esteem (Chan 1997), the effects of pressure perform (Sawano 1997; Rogers, 1998) and racial abuse (Loach and Bloor, 1995). This study is among the first to examine differential rates of bullying for culturally different students in Australia.

Resilience is seen as an attribute that is measurable and quantitative and therefore clearly identifiable as a personality and behavioural trait in particular individuals. Kinard (1998) points out that the factors which define resilience are sometimes also reported as capacities which lead to the development of resilience. That is, having good self-regard, for example may indicate resilience is present or it may facilitate the establishment of resilient behaviour where none was previously demonstrated perhaps due to the absence of adversity.

This becomes a critical matter in the discussion of responses to, and the impact of bullying. While some children may experience chronic life stressors such as poverty, incapacitated parents, maltreatment and school failure, others may be exposed to relatively short-term adversity such as bullying.
The literature with regard to resiliency more often refers to the former circumstance and the plethora of research and discussion on the subject is devoted mainly to the characteristics and indicators of resilience and analysis of the source of such competence given the negative outcomes of abuse which are generally consequent for the child. (Wilson and Gottman 1996; Carver 1998).

The issue of whether bullying constitutes abuse is beginning to have some currency in the literature (Kampulainen et al 1998; Dawkins 1995; Healey 2001 a ) and indications are that the critical defining features of child maltreatment by adults are also applicable to peer abuse. Portwood (1999) explores the possibility of a consensual definition of child maltreatment by examining the diverse parameters offered by a range of professional groups involved in intervention with such children. Legal, health, education and community practitioners include descriptors such as harm or the threat of harm, intention of the perpetrator and negative outcomes for the abused individual as factors by which behaviours can be classified as abusive. While Duncan (1999) suggests that bullying is often viewed by society to be at the ‘milder end of the trauma spectrum’ and that it is viewed as ‘merely a bothersome part of a normal childhood’, this view cannot be sustained given that bullying behaviours clearly fit the parameters of other abusive actions on a number of dimensions including long and short term impact, psychological and physical harm, illegality and incidence.
Bullying is now being interpreted as a legislated child protection issue (Healey op cit, Ambert 1998) and the responsibilities of mandated reporters of abuse are being applied to bullying behaviour. The categories of abuse which yield a diagnosis of psychological maltreatment include “spurning, terrorizing, isolating, exploiting and denying emotional responsiveness” (Hart and Brassard 1991) and “the repetitive, sustained nature of the action (as) a crucial defining feature” (Kent and Waller 1998).

Such descriptors are common in bullying episodes and there is little to differentiate adult/child abuse from peer abuse on these dimensions. The processes and outcomes are predictable, and well documented. Rigby (1994), indicates that the general health of self reported victims of bullying is significantly poorer than that of non-victims with many psychological effects reported including lost sleep due to worry, constant strain and feeling worthless. Victims of bullying have been reported to exhibit higher rates of depression (Duncan, op cit; Neary and Joseph 1994), withdrawal and suicidal thoughts in response to the abuse (Rigby op cit; Prewitt 1988), and to experience emotional disturbances such as anxiety, panic, loneliness and rejection. Others report that victims feel humiliated, ashamed and degraded by the rejection they endure (Besag 1989; Olweus 1993) and develop introverted and socially avoidant behaviour (Slee 1995; Rigby and Slee op cit).
Furthermore there is evidence of long-term impact and the potential for difficulties in interpersonal relationships in adult life as a result of bullying in childhood (Doll 1998). Duncan (op cit) describes a retrospective study in which 46% of college students reported frequent flashbacks to childhood bullying even as young adults, while Matsui et al (1996) found continued depression and low self esteem in Japanese males victimised as children. Bullying increases the likelihood of psychiatric referral and is correlated with clinical psychological disturbance (Kampulainen op cit). Other researchers refer to the reinforcement of self concept for bullies as an outcome of their behaviour at the expense of the self regard of their victims (Marsh, Parada, Yeung and Healey 2001).

The literature discussing resilience in relation to abuse can therefore equally be applied to discussions of the development of resilience in response to bullying. The capacity for young people to survive abuse through the acquisition of resilient behaviour is applicable to the experience of abuse at the hands of peers, just as much as to that experienced from adult abusers. Resilient behaviours which are taught through child protection educational programmes, and which can provide protection, such as reporting to accredited agencies, using assertive verbal statements, avoidance and escape strategies can be equally effective in resisting bullying.

In this case resilience is assumed in the overt resistant behaviours exhibited by the victim, even though the individual may not in fact have resilience to the experience. Therefore, if those overt behaviours can be isolated, taught and demonstrated we can produce individuals who behave with resiliency in the face of peer abuse even when psychological resilience may not be fully established. It is commonly assumed that traumatic events such as psychological or physical abuse inevitably result in psychological harm although some researchers see the need to challenge this in the light of evidence of resiliency (Monaghan-Blout, 1997). The concept of suffering in order to grow—a popularly expressed view in community and school discussions of bullying intervention—needs some refinement if young people are to be protected from bullying and other forms of abuse.

For young people who are not resilient—that is, who do not have the capacity to recover spontaneously from adverse experiences—the notion that exposure to physical and emotional abuse whether through bullying or another source, somehow has the potential for a positive outcome, is clearly questionable. The literature is replete with research which indicates that repeated exposure to maltreatment results in negative psychological and social outcomes for most individuals. (Spatz-Widom 1995, Strang 1995, Besag, op cit).

A continuing theme in society is that bullying somehow assists the growth of ‘character’, ‘manliness’ and resilience.
This notion is usually only applied to bullying of vulnerable children and young people, however, and it is rarely suggested that adults could benefit in the same way from bullying in their personal or work relationships. It is important to consider that irrespective of the degree of resiliency demonstrated by the victim, the emotional impact of bullying is likely to remain substantial. Resilient behaviours are demonstrated despite the distress experienced not as an alternative response to it. Some individuals will couple the emotional pain with overtly effective behavioural responses (resiliency) while others will respond in an ineffective, non-resilient manner along with the distress. The level of resiliency evident in the overt behaviours does not indicate the level of emotional impact and this is a critical factor in intervention in bullying.

Victims of bullying who respond in a more pro-active and self-protective manner should not be viewed as less damaged than those who are incapable of demonstrating effective help-seeking responses. Resilient behaviours do not preclude emotional damage and depression (Luthar, 1997; Spaccarelli and Kim, 1995), and the danger is that apparently resilient individuals will be less well supported and indeed may be excluded from, or denied intervention to halt the abuse on the basis of their more competent social responses. This can increase the emotional impact and lead to re-victimisation through the withholding of support and intervention.
There is some discussion in the literature of the notion of protective factors residing within individuals who respond in a more resilient fashion to abusive situations and these include intellect, (Carver op cit) perceived social support (Byrne op cit) and effective social skills (Doll & Lyon op cit). Nevertheless, we can assume that the abusive behaviour is just as damaging to these individuals but that they have developed overt responses which offer psychological buffers rather than passive responses which expose them to further incidents of abuse. This is relevant to intervention in that the emotional responses of the victim must be a paramount consideration and be fully understood and accepted if the victim is to be successful in establishing more effective and assertive responses.

Consideration also needs to be given to the perception of abuse or adversity held by the ‘victim’, and correspondingly to the evidence of resiliency observed. If the ‘victim’ does not perceive the situation or event to be adverse or abusive, can their responses be described as resilient and coping? In the popular literature individuals are frequently described as resilient and as ‘overcoming adversity’ if, for example, they are successful despite disability. Caution needs to be exercised in this regard since although there can be no question that to succeed despite a disability is to achieve, unless the disability is perceived as an obstacle by the individual there is nothing to overcome. These individuals focus upon their capacities and the development of their skills to the same extent that on-disabled individuals do, and in the process become successful.

We cannot assume that their efforts are based on a determination to overcome adversity if their circumstances are natural for them. Successful disabled athletes need to be as resilient in the face of defeat as successful non-disabled athletes, but their response is related to their perception of their capacity to perform, not their incapacity to do so.

Self-concept is a multi-dimensional attribute (Marsh et al op cit) and is seen as a critical factor in the development of resilience (Hart, D. et al 1997; Rouse, K. et al 1998; Cowen, E. L. et al 1997) as well as being an outcome of resilient responses to adverse situations. Positive self-concept can mediate risk-taking and provide a foundation for the persistent help-seeking behaviour which victimisation demands. Having positive self-concept cannot necessarily protect the victim from the harmful effects of the bullying but may facilitate more assertive responses initially. Victimisation is not necessarily a function of the self-esteem of the victim since individuals having moderate to good self-esteem can nevertheless become the targets of bullies. Indeed, because of the multi-dimensional nature of the concept victims may continue to succeed in academic, physical, social functioning while their self-concept in peer relationships may decline as a result of the bullying.

While it is certainly true that bullies select their targets using specific criteria including the likelihood that they will encounter little or no resistance, they also are aware that their behaviour may well be interpreted as something other than bullying by those to whom the victim turns.

interpreted as something other than bullying by those to whom the victim turns.

The attitudes and indifference of those within the social milieu of the victim contribute substantially to the reinforcement of bullying behaviour. Victims of bullying, whether they have high self regard or not, rely for assistance on those with authority to whom they turn, and given the high social status bullies often enjoy (Healey op cit, Rigby, 1999) it is not always possible for victims to rally the support they need to protect them from the bully. Resiliency in this case provides the capacity to continue to seek help in the face of such indifference or rejection.

It is also important to differentiate factors associated with resilience from actual resilient behaviours in an attempt to adapt resiliency to bullying intervention. If we accept that certain factors correlate with resilience in individuals who have been thus identified—factors such as higher IQ, self-esteem, school performance and social competence (Kinard op cit) we may be reluctant to include young people who do not have these attributes, in our efforts to develop resilient behaviours. While it may be easier to teach resilient behaviours such as help-seeking and assertiveness to individuals who have higher IQ's, self-regard and social functioning, it is important that the skills be also introduced to victims who do not have the attributes as it is possible that some of these may ensue following resiliency training.
Differentiating the key factors correlating with resilience from the behaviors indicative of resiliency is a critical factor in effective intervention.

The terms resiliency and thriving are often used interchangeably but can be differentiated essentially on the basis that thriving can develop in the absence of adversity, while resiliency is only identified in terms of adverse experiences. Unless or until the individual is placed under stress, the competencies of resiliency are not required. However, thriving is often a continuous process illustrating a relatively uninterrupted life course leading to social and emotional competency. For victims of bullying it may be that developmental thriving will facilitate resiliency development if none has previously been demonstrated. Some of the key characteristics identified by Carver (op cit) as indicative of thriving include several personal capacities such as decreased reactivity to stressful events, faster recovery from stress, optimism and confidence, as well as social indicators like consistently high social functioning and security in interpersonal relationships. Other researchers also identify personal characteristics related to thriving as potential mechanisms through which resiliency may be developed. Park (1998) describes stress-related growth as 'mediated by various appraisal and coping processes'. The concept that stress can, in fact result in social or emotional growth is challenging but certainly encouraging in the issue of bullying.
The argument here is that the experience of stress and the responses developed to deal with stress may result in emotional and psychological maturation, which is not the same argument used when it is suggested that exposure to abuse is somehow beneficial. Exposure to manageable levels of stress during which coping mechanisms can be learned, may well be a valuable growth experience, but this cannot be equated to the overwhelmingly damaging results of exposure to abuse. An internal locus of control and well developed friendships also appear to be indicative of the characteristics which pre-dispose individuals to resiliency (Hart et al op cit), as does interpersonal attachment generally (Masten et al op cit). Cognitive processes which contribute to the capacity to recover from adversity are considered by Wilson and Gottman (op cit) and described in terms of ‘attentional focus’. The capacity to mediate affect through shifts in attentional focus, they believe, are fundamental to emotional regulation, and subsequent social functioning. Can victims of bullying be taught to introspectively focus on the emotional impact of the victimisation and then employ cognitive processes to redirect their attention to the use of language and action to effectively resist or avoid the bully? These researchers refer to this ability as “self-soothing” and provide physiological evidence that this capacity can be developed even in young children. If so these skills may be taught and brought to consciousness for implementation in times of stress or adversity such as bullying.
METHODOLOGY

The beliefs, attitudes, perceptions and behaviours of girls in relation to bullying were gathered by means of the School Safety Survey (adapted Jenkin 1997). In response to requests from school executive.

Questionnaire: The survey comprises twelve questions relating specifically to experiences and observations of bullying and safety in high school. The questionnaire had been previously pilot-tested on a high school population in regional NSW and the order, wording and number of questions modified as a result. Questions relate to behaviours (what the student would do, what bullying occurs, Q4,5,6,9); beliefs (what students think is happening in the school, Q5,6,7,8) and attitudes (what students think ought to happen, Q10,11,12), as well as gathering relevant demographic data (Q1,2,3).

This included ten cultural categories (see figure 1) based on countries nominated by respondents as their country of birth.

The survey gives respondents the opportunity to identify the frequency and intensity of bullying experienced through a rating scale. The scale comprises five categories of regularity of bullying, with only the categories which fit the parameters of the bullying definition in relation to persistent or repeated behaviour, considered. These categories were ‘daily or more often’, ‘most days’, ‘weekly’, with behaviours reported in the categories ‘occasionally’ and ‘never’ excluded from the bullying data.
Eight key behaviours most frequently reported by bullied students (Rigby & Slee 1995; Besag 1989) were provided. These were: teasing or name-calling; comments about family, religion or country of birth; being left out on purpose; threatened; hit, kicked or punched; forced to give money or belongings; comments on appearance; and damage to personal property. Students were to select those behaviours experienced while at the school as well as the intensity of their experience. Students were also asked to complete two rating scales which recorded their views on the seriousness of the problem at the school and their beliefs about the morale of students. They were also asked whether they would report to a teacher and whether they would help someone they saw being bullied.

RESULTS

The data revealed that overall 15% of girls reported being bullied. Of those respondents who were bullied, differences were evident based on cultural background:

- 33.3% of Eastern European born girls reported being bullied
- 30% of Indian born girls reported being bullied
- 28.6% of Middle Eastern born girls reported being bullied
- 23.1% of African/Carribean born girls reported being bullied
- 14.8% of Australian/NZ born girls reported being bullied
- 14.3% of Pacific Island born girls reported being bullied
- 13.3% of Asian born girls reported being bullied
- 10.3% of European born girls reported being bullied

Table 1 records the percentage of girls from each cultural group who experienced the type of bullying listed. This table also provides evidence of the intensity of the bullying endured as it is clear that for some cultural groups girls reported experiencing all of the listed behaviours, while for others only some of the behaviours were evident. Eastern European born girls fared the worst with respondents reporting bullying across all the behaviours to a significant degree including:

- 85.7% bullied by teasing,
- 57.1% bullied by comments on their appearance
- 28.6% bullied by comments on family, religion or country of birth
- 28.6% bullied by threats

Asian born girls were also significantly bullied with respondents reporting bullying across all behaviours including:

- 65% bullied by teasing,
- 35% bullied by comments on family, religion or country of birth
- 30% bullied by damage to their property
- 25% bullied by being left out of things on purpose

Australian/New Zealand born girls also reported experiencing all forms of bullying including:

- 52% bullied by teasing,
- 49.7% bullied by comments on their appearance
- 39% bullied by comments on family, religion or country of birth
- 23.8% bullied by being left out of things on purpose

Other cultural groups reported several types of bullying:

Middle Eastern born girls were bullied across seven of the eight listed behaviours including:

75% bullied by comments on family, religion or country of birth

75% bullied by comments on their appearance

50% bullied by being left out of things on purpose

and 25% being bullied across all other behaviours except threats.

European born, Indian and African / Caribbean girls also reported bullying across seven of the eight behaviours. The remaining respondents, although small in number, nevertheless indicated they had been bullied in more than one way. For Indian respondents 100% were bullied in 5 of the 8 behaviours listed.

Table 2 records responses to the question of how serious a problem they thought bullying was at the school, and some surprising results emerged which warrant further discussion:

Although Eastern European girls experienced most bullying, the majority (57.2%) saw bullying at the school as only a minor or mild problem. None reported it as a serious or major problem. Of the Australian/New Zealand born respondents, despite being significantly bullied, the majority (54.9%) indicated it was not a problem or was a mild/minor problem at the school.

Only 23.4% saw it as serious or major.
Middle Eastern students were bullied significantly but also indicated in the main (75%) that they viewed bullying as not a problem to a mild problem in the school. African /Caribbean were also bullied in many ways but viewed bullying as not a problem (33.3%) to a minor problem (66.7%). Indian students who were significantly bullied in most ways listed, viewed bullying as mainly a mild problem (66.7%) but 33.3% also expressed the view that it was a serious problem. Asian girls on the other hand were also seriously bullied and 45% of these respondents expressed the view that bullying was a serious or major problem. The students most likely to see bullying as serious were Pacific Islands (100%) and USA/Canada (50%) but neither of these groups was a seriously bullied as others mentioned.

Table 3 records responses to the question ‘would you report to a teacher?’

The majority of students in all cultural groups would the behaviours report to a teacher if they knew someone who was being bullied. This included 75% of Middel Eastern and nearly 60% of Eastern European girls who were seriously bullied but did not view bullying as a major problem. Overall, in spite of their own experiences of bullying and their views about its seriousness, however, the majority of respondents would report the behaviour to a teacher if they became aware of it.

Table 4. This question asked if the school makes students feel good about themselves, and overall 39.3% said they felt that most students feel good. A significant proportion (39%), felt that only some students feel good and 16.2% felt that very few feel good as a result of the school.
Students who were significantly bullied across most of the behaviours listed including Eastern European, Asian, European and African / Caribbean born girls were the most likely to report that only some students feel good. Australian/New Zealand Asian and African /Caribbean respondents also expressed the view that very few feel good.

Table 5

Overwhelmingly, (75-100%) and irrespective of their own experiences of bullying and views about its seriousness, respondents said they would help someone they saw being bullied. Significantly, Middle Eastern girls were most likely to say they would not help (25%) as were Australian/New Zealand(16.7%) and Asian (10%) respondents.

DISCUSSION

The results yielded some apparently contradictory findings that may be explained by cultural differences in girls resiliency to bullying. It would seem reasonable to expect that those students who are seriously bullied in school would view the matter as a serious or major problem and would be willing to report the behaviours and assist others they saw being bullied. It would also seem reasonable that they would believe that such behaviours in the school would mean that the school does not help students feel good about themselves. These expectations were not readily apparent, however.

The most seriously bullied were the Eastern European girls with 33.3% of the total sample of this cultural group bullied across all types of behaviour. Nevertheless, these respondents did not view bullying as a serious or major problem and felt that some or most students felt good about themselves at school.
They were willing to assist and to report in regards to bullying but the overall cumulative impression revealed in the data is that their own experiences of bullying had not impacted on their views about school or their appropriate functioning. This seems to support the notion of resiliency in the face of the adverse experience of bullying. It could also however indicate a greater tolerance of bullying as an expected behaviour while at school.

Asian students on the other hand were also significantly bullied but only half were willing to report the behaviours. Asian respondents were some of a very few who were not willing to assist those they saw being bullied. They also expressed the view that very few or only some students feel good about themselves in school. It appears that their responses to bullying are more negative and result in a degree of hopelessness about what can be done in the circumstances. This could indicate a reduced degree of resilience to the phenomena. Although there was only a small sample of Indian students, (N=10) their results indicated a different response to bullying. Despite being bullied in many ways they were willing to assist others and felt that most students feel good at school. They were also more likely to view bullying as a serious problem and to report to a teacher. Again, they indicate a range of appropriately resilient and assertive responses to bullying which may well provide a buffer to the effects of the behaviour.

Overall, if indeed there are protective factors which reside within the individual (Carver 1998) these could be in evidence in the responses of these students.
Perceived social support (Byrne, 1993) is one such factor and it may well be evident here in the form of anticipated teacher assistance and in the belief that the school makes students feel good about themselves. Further, self-esteem and social skills are implicated in resilience and by stating their willingness to assist others and to report to teachers respondents may well be exhibiting these attributes as indicators of resiliency. Students who feel that their experiences of bullying reflect an overall poor quality of life at school may in fact be less resilient. Their poor regard for the capacity of teachers to assist them and others in the matter may also result from an overall lower resistance, poorer social skills and a consequent lack of resilience to the behaviours.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>AFRICAN/ASIAN</th>
<th>USA/Canada</th>
<th>PACIFIC ISLANDS</th>
<th>AUSTRALIA/NZ</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN/EUROPEAN</th>
<th>EASTERN EUROPEAN</th>
<th>MIDDLE EASTERN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied females</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical damages</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Question</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Bullied females by country of birth by type of bullying experienced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Girls</th>
<th>% of Boys</th>
<th>Total Bullied Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Caribbean</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Cultural Differences in Girls’ Resilience to Bullying

Jean B. Healey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total Females</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Males</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN/Caribbean</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/NZ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Question:**

Table A: % of girls who believe the school makes students feel good about themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country of birth of student</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within country of birth of student</th>
<th>%BULLIED</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>african/caribbean</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>indian</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5: WOULD YOU HELP SOMEONE YOU SAW BEING BULLIED? Survey question 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe/Depends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/NZ</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/CNADA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Caribbean</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bullied females</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>% Bullied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not bullied</td>
<td>bullied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/NZ/Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Within Country of Birth of Student</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Bullied</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% of Total</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Resilience is variously described as a predisposition towards positive expectations and outcomes despite adverse experiences and, as the development of the capacity to overcome adversity despite natural predispositions to stress responses. Irrespective of the source, whether innate or acquired, the competency that resilience represents is a critical factor in resisting bullying. Resiliency refers to the behaviours, which seem to indicate that the victim of abuse has resilience and, is able to continue to function as an adaptive individual. Various factors have been identified as correlational with, or some argue pre-requisite to, the ability to recover from adversity including, positive self-regard, academic success, positive social and emotional adjustment and adaptive social skills. In the context of bullying intervention and resistance this paper argues that, for those who are not naturally resilient it may be necessary to teach the competencies associated with resiliency, thereby equipping victims with psychological strengths with which to respond with resiliency in an assertive and effective manner.

Broadly speaking, the term 'resilience' describes the capacity to 'bounce back' from adverse experiences, retain psychological equilibrium, continue to perform in a competent manner and generally give little overt indication of the impact of an adverse event. This results either from a naturally positive predisposition or from a deliberate effort to present this impression despite the stress endured. Various researchers have defined resilience in operational terms, distinguishing responses to stress or abuse in terms of observable and measurable competent behaviours. Masten, Best and Garmery (1990) differentiate resilience on three separate dimensions, a) positive outcomes despite experiencing high-risk environments, b) competent functioning in the face of acute and chronic life stressors and, c) recovery from trauma. Children who are able to "function within normal or acceptable bounds on measures of competence with respect to behavioural, social and/or cognitive functioning" despite adverse experiences (Kinnard, 1998) are similarly identified as resilient, as are those who score within the normal range on accepted clinical measures such as the Achenbach Child Behaviour Checklist (Achenbach, 1991) following stressful events.

The terms 'resilience' and 'resiliency' are used to indicate separate concepts within the framework of this discussion. While 'resilience' or 'resilient' are terms used to describe a state of being, 'resiliency' is used to refer to the overt behaviours evident in those who seem to have resilience. The purpose of making the distinction is to support the argument that resiliency behaviours can be taught and acquired, then utilised as a means of resisting bullying irrespective of whether the individual actually is resilient. This discussion takes place in the context of an effort to establish the efficacy of a program of intervention for bullying, which includes resiliency training (Healey, 2001a). The following key issues need to be examined:

- A theoretical construction of what constitutes resiliency in relation to bullying;
- Identification of apparently protective factors in the social milieu which may assist in the development of resiliency if provided to victims of bullying;
- The proposition that the positive interpersonal competencies identified as resiliency can be taught to victims of bullying to assist in the development of a repertoire, which facilitates resistance and recovery. Resiliency in Relation to Bullying

Resiliency in Relation to Bullying

Resilience has been thoroughly dissected as a psychological and social phenomenon by researchers interested in the apparent capacity of victims to cope with various levels and types of trauma. Resilience is variously described as a predisposition towards positive expectations and outcomes despite adverse experiences or as the development of the capacity to overcome adversity despite natural predispositions to stress responses. Resilience is an attribute developed in some individuals as an outcome of interactional experiences. The focus of much of the discussion of this phenomenon is on the origins and defining features of the state of being resilient or having resilience in a range of contexts including psychological and developmental competency (Kert & Waller, 1998).

Resiliency on the other hand, can be defined as the demonstrable behaviours by which resilience can be identified. Individuals having a particular behavioural repertoire, which includes the verbal and social skills used to facilitate their
resistance to stress and adversity, can be said to be demonstrating resiliency. The difference, is not merely semantic but functional, and acknowledgment of this is critical if an attempt is to be made to assist young people to develop the capacity to resist bullying through resiliency, irrespective of the actual degree of resiliency they possess.

If the behaviours which indicate a naturally occurring resilient state can be identified, described and measured, then it may be possible to teach individuals who are not naturally resilient, to behave as if they were, and thereby provide an effective strategy for overcoming the effects of bullying. Interest has been shown in mapping these components for instruction (Masten et al., 1990). It should also be noted, however, that the capacity to demonstrate resiliency should not preclude victims from protective intervention, and does not negate the stressful impact of the bullying behaviour. Nor should the competency of the victim in seeking assistance in any way, reduce the level of responsibility of the bully.

The popular contention that bullying prepares young people psychologically for 'real world' challenges involves a fundamental curiosity of the notion of resiliency. While young people do need to develop self-protective attitudes and behaviours in order to cope with life's disappointments and challenges, to apply a philosophy of tolerance for abuse to the issue of bullying is no more acceptable for young people, than it would be if directed towards adults in abusive situations. It is rarely suggested that adults in abusive relationships should take the opportunity to develop inner strength and psychological fortitude, nor that they will emerge from the situation having experienced personal growth. Although a popular view, this notion needs to be reviewed in relation to peer abuse, if young people are to secure the protection needed to avoid bullying.

While there are specific defining features of the behaviour described as lying (Jenkin 1994; Olweus 1993; Smith, 1994) it is now routinely discussed as abusive and traumatic (Rigby & Slocum, 1993; Besag 1989; Pikas, 1989) and is perceived as having as great a psychological impact as other forms of abuse (Byrne 1993, Finkelthor & Dzuiba-Leatherman 1994; Healey, 2001b). Discussion throughout this paper is premised on the status of bullying in this capacity. Over the past ten years, bullying has become a major focus of research and concern in schools (Rigby & Slocum, 1993; Besag, 1989), and during this time definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, differentiating bullying behaviour from violence, fighting, play and general conflict on a number of critical dimensions:

- Lack of reciprocity: bullying involves the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who is not aggressive in return. The lack of reciprocity differentiates bullying from fighting and conflict (Jenkin, 1994; Besag, 1989).
- Repetition: bullying involves more than one event often occurring as a pattern of hurtful behaviour over a period of time, which differentiates it from episodic violence or assault (Olweus, 1993).
- Intentionality: the purpose of bullying is to harm the recipient. Intentionality must be examined in relation to the claimed intention of the bully (often diminishing the purpose), the actual impact on the victim and the congruence of the two.
- Power: there is an unmistakable power differential between the bully and victim, which does not always correlate with the size, age or formal social status of the bully or victim.

### Theoretical Constructs for Resiliency

In considering the application of resiliency to intervention in bullying, the relevance and efficacy of a range of theoretical constructs of resiliency need examination. This is in order to provide justification and verification for the teaching of resilient behaviours and skills. Theorists, variously describe resiliency as a psychological protective facility, (Jew and Green 1998, McCubbin 1998) a social skill and a developmental indicator in an attempt to unravel the key components. In terms of this discussion, resiliency is seen as a set of capacities, which can be acquired and applied in a situation where there is trauma, through bullying and several theorists appear to support this view.

Flow theory has been discussed as a model for enhancing student resilience (Parr, Montgomery, & DeBell, 1998) through a process of alerting them to their individual interpretations of life experiences. The theory has been applied by the original theorist, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) to a wide range of risk-oriented activities, such as mountain climbing, ocean racing and other peak experiences as a means of analysing growth through challenge. Parr et al., suggest that the capacity for resilience may develop in the same way that solitary ordeals contribute to personal growth in that the individual takes a pro-active perspective, which sees challenge in hardship and meets hardship by formulating goals for recovery. The capacity to formulate goals for action within the challenging environment and the belief that the self has the interpersonal resources to overcome the challenges results in "flow" or an ordering of consciousness towards a positive outcome.

According to Parr et al. (ibid), in a matrix they formulate consisting of the key elements of challenge and skill at high and low levels, 'psychological flow, depends on achieving the right balance between how challenging one's goals are and how effective one's skills are, in meeting those challenges' (p. 28).

High challenge coupled with high skill will result in 'flow' or a positive outcome while high challenge with low skill will result in anxiety. The theory is relevant to this discussion of resiliency in relation to bullying, as it acknowledges the need for skills development or acquisition in the areas of self-talk, self-belief and goal-setting, in order to successfully meet challenges, and this capacity can certainly be trained or taught, for example, in cognitive restructuring approaches.
Flow theory, however, is premised on the engagement of individuals in often deliberately selected challenging experiences, which of course is not the case in victimisation through bullying. Nevertheless, if the victim of bullying can be assisted to view their experience as a challenge to be overcome, and for which they need to set goals for resistance, the outcome may be more positive. "Flow" will develop in victims of bullying who can restructure their thinking about the experience towards an interpretation, which is empowering and proactive rather than anxiety-producing. Parr et al. (1993) believe that the development of a high level of skills, in this case psychological resistance, will facilitate meeting any challenge and it could be argued that this would also apply to bullying. This portrays the individual as resourceful, thoughtful and pro-active, even though they may not be fully equipped to meet the challenge. This is probably a more realistic appraisal than that so often expressed, that victims of bullying, are ineffectual and passive in their responses. Many factors combine to prevent a victim to avoid bullying, not the least of which is the non-supportive environment, in which the events occur, but this does not mean the victimised individual is passive. If the challenge of bullying is compounded by the further challenge of an unsupportive peer group, unsafe or unmonitored environment and uninvolved adults, there is a multiplication of the original challenge by several factors, which may overwhelm the individual. Flow theory explains the capacity of the individual to devise means to meet the challenge of bullying given interpersonal competencies and skills such as goal directed behaviour. Resiliency results from the achievement of these goals despite hostile or neglectful environments.

McCubbin, et al. (1998) applied Antonovsky’s salutogenic theory (1987) to the concept of resiliency. They discussed several factors believed to counteract the tendency towards stress and disease including three psychological aspects, which contribute to a resilient response to adversity: comprehension of the current adverse situation; manageability or the capacity to use current skills to address the current challenge; and meaningfulness or the ability to derive meaning from the demands confronted.

Fundamentally, if applied to the event of bullying:

a) The bullying experience will be compounded by a lack of knowledge about bullying particularly if others in the victim’s environment interpret the behaviour differently. If the victim can recognise the behaviour as bullying they will be better prepared for an assertive response. If the victim is made to feel that their interaction with the bully is a ‘conflict of fight’, however, due to the interpretation of the behaviour by others in their environment, they will not be encouraged to respond appropriately. At the most basic level, the victim and others in their social milieu must be able to identify bullying and differentiate it from conflict, fighting and other reciprocal interactions;

b) A lack of skills for resistance will result in a negative outcome, which is why the proposition is made that such skills and knowledge be acquired through a training program. If the victim of abuse believes that they have the skills to cope with the situation including reporting skills, they will develop resistance and resiliency in the event of the abuse;

c) If victims can emerge from the experience with an interpretation, which provides meaningfulness— for example that locates the deficit within the bully and not within themselves- the outcome is more likely to be positive and resilient.

As a psychological theory, salutogenesis has found support because of the emphasis on the sense of coherence in individuals and the departure from an illness/failure-based model to one, which recognises innate capacities for resilience. McCubbin et al., (1990) present relevant discussions, relating to the sense of coherence in the management of stress and change. "The inherent abilities of the human system to counteract the tendency towards stress and disease" (McCubbin et al., 1990) is the foundation belief linking this model to the proposed intervention whereby individuals can be taught to draw on or further develop this capacity to counteract victimisation. This theory supports the notion that victims of bullying have an innate predisposition to resist stress and anxiety and can be held to validate the efficacy of teaching resilient behaviours.

Cowan, Cowan & Schulz (1996) consider risk and resilience in families, exploring the concept of multiple vulnerabilities and risks, which compound the impact of adversity on susceptible individuals. They discuss protection and buffering mechanisms within families as means to develop resilience. In this context, resilience unfolds overtime as the individual practices resistant behaviours, which are met with positive responses in their environment that in turn leads to the development of competence through resiliency.

As an example, the child who expresses discomfort at the teasing or physical interactions of a sibling or parent, and whose protestations lead to the cessation of the behaviour without rejection, will begin to move along a pathway towards legitimate resistant behaviour and resiliency. The authors further indicate that psychological distress is minimised through
the process and view the interactions as preventative. With regard to the bullying paradigm, it becomes clear that without protective and buffering mechanisms within the victim’s environment, be it school or home, resilient behaviours alone cannot protect the individual.

The way in which bullying behaviours are perceived and acknowledged, however, often determines the degree of persistence and ultimate effectiveness of victims. In an unprotected and unreceptive environment where efforts to resist bullying through, for example reporting or escape are thwarted, ignored or even punished, resilience will not develop and the stress may well be multiplied. Dubrow, Roecker & D’Imperio (1997) similarly explore risk and protective mechanisms that contribute to adjustment and resiliency in children and adolescents, with an emphasis on interventions, which promote competence in young people. These theorists believe that resiliency can be developed through the acquisition of resilient behaviours taught through an appropriate intervention. Finally, Wills, Blechman & McNamara (1996) offer further support for a competency-based model for the development of resiliency in their discussion of the impact of family and social supports and the contribution of these to coping and competence in young people. In examining substance use in young people, they use the perspective of a developmental continuum of resilience reinforced by supportive family and social environments.

Resiliency as a set of social skills rather than an innate capacity evolving from psychological character traits is an attractive theory since it proposes a pragmatic solution. If resiliency comprises specific demonstrable skills, behaviours and attitudes, it is likely that it can be taught and acquired. Several researchers take this view and examine social problem-solving skills in relation to levels of adjustment and resiliency.

Luthar (1997) and others, however, discuss a multi-dimensional model of resiliency whereby stress levels are not necessarily reduced by the demonstration of skills. Resiliency comprises interpersonal developmental and psychological capacities, as well as socially acquired skills young people may remain competent in some areas such as academic achievement, maintenance of social status through sports, etc., yet experience high levels of stress and anxiety in response to adversity. This perspective supports the view expressed elsewhere in this paper that overt compensatory behaviours which appear to be effective, may well mask underlying severe stress reactions to bullying or other adverse situations and cannot be viewed as evidence that resilience inculcates individuals from stress. Nevertheless, the acquisition and application of resilient behaviours can result in demonstrable resiliency despite internal stress, and if this deters a bully from further interference, the victim will benefit.

The purpose of developing resistant behaviours is not to deny the impact of the bullying behaviour but to provide an interim response, which may divert the bully and thereby give some relief from stress temporarily. Victims need to behave as though they are resilient in order to secure relief from the victimisation.

Social Protective Factors

It may be relevant, in the context of this discussion therefore, to explore the differences between those individuals exposed to long-term stress and those whose experiences are relatively shorter term although no less intense. Do individuals in the former category develop resiliency, despite the adverse conditions or in response to them, therefore being equipped to deal with bullying? Do some bullied individuals enter the adverse situation, already equipped with the requisite capacities for coping having had the opportunity to develop in non-adversarial, supportive environments? The answer to these questions may determine the effectiveness of resiliency training for young people. Gilligan (2000) proposes that positive school and spare time experiences have a protective value for young people experiencing adversity and can lead to the development of resilience. He delineates five key concepts, which he believes are relevant in this context:

- Reduction of the range or number of adverse circumstances experienced by the young person.
- Recognition or provision of valuable experiences, which can provide a turning point in their development.
- Secure attachments and relationships.
- Self worth and;
- Perceived self-efficacy.

These broadly summarise the propositions of other researchers in the discussion of what elements in the social milieu of the abused individual, lead to a display of resilient behaviours (resiliency) in response to adverse events. There is an understanding that resiliency is a combination of intrapersonal and interpersonal factors, which provide the competence and confidence to resist the impact of the adverse experience. While we cannot deny the impact of the abusive encounter, discussion is needed regarding the psychological preparedness that secure, meaningful and supportive peer and other relationships provide for individuals to enable them to cope with adversity.

Tiet et al (1998) identified family functioning, close parental monitoring, and access to other supportive adults as factors in the presentation of resiliency in young people at risk. Wills, Blechman & McNamara (1996) also nominate family
structure and support as contributing to the development of coping and competence in urban middle school children. However, can protective family experiences ensure the development of resiliency and the capacity to respond to adversity effectively?

Swihart and Cotter (1997) take the view that young individuals who do not cope with life's stressful situations have become manipulative and lacking independence as a result of over-protective parenting, and seem to assume that by parents 'stepping out of the way and regaining control', changes to the coping styles of the individual will result. It is difficult to endorse this position and, in the case of bullied young people, it could set the scene for increased vulnerability to the bullying behaviour as a result of the withdrawal of social supports. However, Olweus (1993) and other researchers (Bowen, Smith & Binney, 1994) have suggested that protective family situations may deter the development of independence and assertive behaviours, and may be a factor in the assumption of passive and ineffectual social interaction styles.

Alternatively, Morrison, Robertson & Harding (1998), assert that perceived parental and teacher involvement are critical to the development of resiliency in young people, while Donald, Wallis and Cockburn (1997) and Luther (1997) examine peer solidarity and popularity as factors, in the development and application of resiliency. The range of research and analysis afforded the concept of resiliency in relation to protective social factors yield several constellations of characteristics, which seem to indicate that the skills of resiliency, that is the behaviours by which resilience can be identified, can be exhibited irrespective of the availability of social supports.

If resiliency is a learned behaviour, which can be demonstrated rather than a dispositional characteristic or a socially precipitated competency, the possibility of teaching resilient behaviours may become realistic. The key component, which prescribes resiliency, therefore is the acquisition and application of resilient behaviours and skills. Being identified as resilient, means being observed to behave in a resilient manner, recovering from the emotional impact of adversity, maintaining social functioning and engaging in defensive behaviours. It may very well be possible to teach these requisite skills and attitudes to develop a measure of resilience in individuals exposed to peer abuse or bullying, irrespective of social protective factors.

Teaching Resiliency

If resiliency is a critical factor in resisting bullying, it is as a learned capacity, rather than innate or a personality trait. Throughout the substantial literature regarding resiliency, ample evidence is provided that it comprises specific skills and behaviours demonstrated in response to adversity as much as it reflects personal strengths or ability. While theorists also express the view that innate characteristics facilitate resiliency it is the more pragmatic theories, which receive the greatest currency in this discussion, as they can be dissected into specific strategies of proven effectiveness. Resiliency may be incorporated as a set of teachable skills in an intervention designed to assist young people to resist and recover from bullying. Teaching resiliency could be a critical component of intervention in bullying and the efforts of several researchers in teaching such skills, supports the view that such an approach is viable.

Dubow, et al (1997) suggest the school environment is the most effective and efficient place in which to introduce interventions for young people at risk because of access, the range of professional skills available and the social expectation that training and information will be provided. Other researchers (Suber-Azaroff & Mayer, 1977) and society, view the large resource allocation to education services as providing the ethical and responsible intervention, which echoes the belief, that behaviour change and management are expectations of the profession.

Several programs have been devised which have been targeted at developing resiliency or component skills Dubow et al (1997) "I CAN DO " project was devised to enhance social problem-solving skills and provides a six step response to challenging situations requiring the young person to focus on practical and possible solutions. A key factor in the relevance of this program to the development of the current intervention is the inclusion of peer support strategies to mediate the distress of the situations encountered. This research indicated that outcomes were sustained at a five-month follow-up and children were able to apply the coping strategies learned in scenarios representing various stressful situations, given peer and social supports. The nominated skills, reflect capacities other researchers have identified as typical of resilient individuals including management of affect through discussion, cognitive introspection and focus, deliberate choices of responses and effective implementation in simulated situations.

However, Planta & Walsh (1998) caution that school based programs, which teach skills in isolation are problematic as they do not consider the holistic developmental process component of resiliency, nor do they include the real context in which the skills will be needed. Bark (1998) describes an intervention, which was implemented to assist child survivors of the Bosnian war develop resiliency to stress and to reduce the impact of the trauma experienced.

In this intervention, acknowledgment was made of the high levels of stress resulting from the experience, but efforts were nevertheless made to develop retrospective strategies for coping. This research revealed particular mechanisms for survival post-trauma including social support and connectedness and psychological distancing from the events using
cognitive restructuring, relaxation and thought monitoring all of which may be strategies of use in the development of resiliency following the trauma of bullying.

Fantuzzo and colleagues (Fantuzzo, Coolahan & Weiss, 1996; Fantuzzo, Sutton-Smith, Atkins & Meyers, 1997) have proposed a Resilient Partnership Directed Approach, which accesses resilient individuals in the community and involves them in, among other activities, child-teen partnerships to enhance social functioning. Overall, the prospect of teaching skills which provide victimised individuals with behaviours by which resilience can be demonstrated is supported in the literature even given Pianta and Walsh's (1998) words of caution opposing the teaching of isolated skills, is a legitimate inclusion in an intervention to resist bullying. The prevailing theoretical perspectives of resilience support several contradictory viewpoints, such that resilience may be the result of innate personality characteristics, or resilience may be a composite of learned social responses unrelated to personality. In terms of its application to the bullying paradigm, this discussion also asserts that resiliency skills and behaviours may provide a buffer for the stress and anxiety, related to traumatic experiences of peer abuse and that resiliency teaching can provide, effective pro-active response strategies for those being bullied, irrespective of the anxiety related to the experience. Protective factors therefore, seem to include personal characteristics, social support mechanisms and the acquisition of specific skills and strategies.

The approach taken in this discussion is that although the personality characteristics identified in the bullied individual may seem to preclude resiliency, it is possible to teach the necessary skills to enable the individual to behave in a resilient manner, given a supportive social milieu (Healey, 2001a). It is proposed, therefore, that having accepted resilience as a state of being identified by the demonstration of particular behaviours, such as effective verbal and social resistance strategies, management of overt affect in response to adversity and effective help and support seeking skills, a case has been established for the possibility that resiliency can be taught even in the absence of true psychological resilience. This is a hopeful proposition, which provides a sound foundation for the development of a research-based intervention for individuals being bullied at school.
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Abstract
Peer Advocacy is a helping strategy which provides victims of bullying with an individual mentor to assist them in their efforts to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy is an innovative adaptation of the advocacy process successfully employed to support individuals with disability and other community members who seek justice through the aid of knowledgeable and capable others. It is a new approach to intervention in bullying as it requires peers of victims of bullying to accept responsibility for their protection and to offer structured assistance. Very little will change in the current social responses to bullying and victimisation if this cannot be affected. The theoretical foundation for Peer Advocacy is constructed from both recent original research and an examination of a range of theories not previously considered in relation to bullying. Data collected in four metropolitan high schools in NSW, sought student opinions on: the seriousness of bullying in their school, their inclination to report bullying they were aware of to a teacher, the capacity of the school to make students feel good about themselves and student willingness to assist others they saw being bullied. Analysis of the data revealed significant differences in the attitudes and perceptions of bullied students and the general populations of the schools and between schools. This provided the research base to support the conceptualisation of structured peer intervention. Further, the concept is grounded in theories of advocacy, the psychology of victimization and resilience, social capital and child protection. Each of these is shown in another document by the same author, to support the notion that bullied young people can secure the assistance and intervention to which they are entitled by seeking help from trained and trusted peers who then act for and with them in their approaches to authorities. Peer Advocacy comprises specific operational and philosophical principles related to bullying intervention as a responsibility of the peers of victimised individuals. These structures and processes are fully described in another document and this paper describes the foundations of the intervention, based on recent research.
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Peer Advocacy represents a new approach to intervention for victims of bullying as it proposes the inclusion of peers in a systematic process which demands a morally and legally conscientious response from those in authority. It necessitates the induction of young people into a training program to develop the attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation and empathy to speak out and secure assistance for individuals who are being hurt through bullying. Advocacy has been accepted in the literature as an established and effective means of providing qualified support for needy individuals in the quest for improved services otherwise denied them as a consequence of their personal incapacities or lack of skills (Ward and Page-Hanify, 1986). Advocacy is proposed in a range of circumstances including advocacy for children who are abused, neglected or exhibiting mental health difficulties or disabilities (Balcazar, 1996; Knitzer, 1996; Paull, 1998; Watkins and Callicut, 1997). Peer Advocacy draws on the successful tradition of having others act on behalf of those in need and applies similar principles and practices to the training of young people to take responsibility for assisting peers who are victims of bullying.

Research Validating the Need for Peer Advocacy

Methodology

The formulation of the Peer Advocacy response to peer abuse emanated in part from research which examined student perceptions, attitudes and beliefs about the impact of bullying in four metropolitan high schools in Sydney. Data collected utilising the School Safety Survey related to the types, intensity and frequency of peer abuse in their schools. Among other issues students also expressed their views regarding the seriousness of the problem, (question 5) their willingness to report abuse to a teacher, (question 6b) the capacity of the school to help students feel good about themselves (question 7) and their own willingness to help those being bullied (question 8). Analyses of these responses provided a clear picture of the critical role of students as advocates for their bullied peers.
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Research Question 1. What are secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying?

Research Question 2. What are bullied secondary school students’ perceptions and beliefs about the nature of school bullying?

The research was undertaken in the greater Sydney metropolitan area, in New South Wales with a range of schools where bullying was seen as an issue by school administrators. The School Safety Survey was administered to over three thousand high school students in four schools including single sex, co-educational, denominational, private and state schools over a three year period 1999-2001. These were schools that requested information and assistance concerning bullying in their specific location during the period of this investigation. School 1 (Captain Cook High School) was a metropolitan state co-educational high school, a selective school for sport in northern Sydney (n=623); School 2 (Mary Immaculate College) was a private Catholic girls’ high school in southern Sydney (n=780); School 3 (Magdalena Anglican College) was a private Church of England girls’ high school in south eastern Sydney (n=916); School 4 (St. Barnabas Catholic College) was a Catholic co-ed high school in western Sydney (n=964). This resulted in a large total sample (n=3,283) comprising: 900 (27.4%) males and 2,383 (72.6%) females Pseudonyms are used for each of the four participating schools to protect confidentiality. Results pertaining to key constructs are presented for all participants and separately for participants who identified themselves as students who had experienced bullying.

Data analysis

To address the research questions and determine the need for Peer Advocacy data relating to student responses to the attitudes questions was analysed.

Table 1 records the results of the multivariate F-tests for all students with respect to the four questions concerning students’ attitudes towards bullying. In these analyses there were two independent variables. These were students’ bullied status (i.e. students were designated as either not bullied or bullied), and either their gender, country of birth, year level, or school depending on the analysis. The dependent variables were questions 5, 6b, 7 and 8 from the School Safety Survey.
Table 1 indicates a main effect for bullied status ("Bully") for all analyses, a main effect for culture in all but the gender analysis, and an interaction effect for the year analyses. The main effect for bullying indicates that the mean of bullied and non-bullied students' responses to the attitude questions differed regardless of their gender, country of birth, and school (but not regardless of their year level in school because a bully x year interaction effect was present). The main effect for culture indicates that students from different countries and schools answered the four questions differently regardless of whether they were bullied or not. The bully x year interaction effect indicates that both students' bullied status and their year level simultaneously influenced their responses to each of the four attitude questions. Each of these main and interaction effects is decomposed with respect to the individual questions in Table 2.

Table 2 records results of the univariate F-tests with school and bullied status as independent variables. Table 2 indicates that bullied and non-bullied students' answers to the first three questions differed regardless of their school, with bullied students more inclined to report, seeing bullying as more of a problem and saying that their school made students feel less good about themselves. In every case, students' answers to the bullying attitude questions differed across schools regardless of the bullied status of students. This finding suggests that specific school contexts may be a salient influence on students' attitudes towards bullying.

Table 3 records the results of the Profile Analysis of not-bullied and bullied students' responses to questions regarding students' attitudes to bullying. Table 3 indicates the main effects for group (bullied or not) and question, and the interaction effect (group x question), were all significant. The interaction is of interest in the Profile Analysis. Decomposition of the interaction effect indicates that non-bullied students see bullying as less of a problem than bullied students, and report that their school makes students feel better about themselves than bullied students (hence, the interaction). Both groups of students responded similarly to the last question. In summary, bullied and non-bullied participants have different opinions regarding the seriousness of the problem, their willingness to report and to assist, and the capacity of the school to help them feel good.
In every case students’ responses to the questions related to attitudes towards bullying differed irrespective of their bullied status. Further analyses of the data indicate significant correlations in bullied students’ evaluations of the seriousness of the problem of bullying in their school. In all schools the majority of bullied students viewed the problem as moderately severe with a significant proportion indicating it as a serious problem. Each school therefore needs to recognise and address bullied students’ concerns about the seriousness of the problem even though the majority of students surveyed in each location did not view the problem as serious, evidently since they were not personally effected. The legitimate concerns of bullied students at individual schools obviously need to be addressed to ensure protection from victimisation.

As discussed earlier significant differences are also shown in the willingness of bullied individuals and others to report bullying to a teacher and this further indicates a need for a customised school intervention. There are significant differences between schools in terms of their perceived capacity to maintain student self-esteem. It is apparent that for some schools there is a significant difference in student perceptions about the capacity of the school to offer support and that intervention for the particular school would need to focus on improvement in this area, or formalisation or maintenance of the current supportive structures. Further evidence of the necessity for intervention is provided in the responses to question 8 regarding the willingness of students to assist others they saw being bullied. While bullied students across each school were almost equally willing to help, some students feel more inclined to offer assistance and this could be related to their relatively more positive perception of the amount of support available within the school.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>df^1</th>
<th>df^2</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>η^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Gender</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Country</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3179</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x Year</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9537</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Bully x School</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9537</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-Tests for Responses by All Students to Questions 5, 6b, 7, and 8 by Gender, Country of Birth, Year Level and School.
Table 2

Responses of All Students (Non-Bullied and Bullied) to Questions 5, 6b, 7, 8 by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and #</th>
<th>Capt. Cook</th>
<th>Mary Immac.</th>
<th>Magdalena</th>
<th>St Barnabas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 How big a problem is bullying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.61&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6b Would you report bullying to a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.43&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.45&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Does school make students feel good?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.63&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Would you help someone you know being bullied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bull</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.13&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reading across the rows of Table 4 means sharing any identical superscripts are not significantly different at the 0.05 level. Reading down the columns of Table 4 boldfaced figures indicate adjacent means significantly different at 0.05 level.
Table 3. Profile Analysis of Responses to Questions 5, 6b, 7 and 8 (All Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Feel Good</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Bullied</td>
<td>2.62(^a)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.40(^b)</td>
<td>2.60(^c)</td>
<td>1.17(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>3.46(^e)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.50(^b)</td>
<td>2.29(^c)</td>
<td>1.20(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.04(^w)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.45(^x)</td>
<td>2.44(^y)</td>
<td>1.18(^z)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reading across the rows of Table 5, means with any identical superscripts are not different at the 0.05 level. Reading down the columns of Table 5, boldfaced means are significantly different from each other at the 0.05 level.

Main Effect of Group: \( F(1, 617) = 83.77, p = .000, \eta^2 = .026 \)

Main Effect of Question: \( F(3, 3184) = 1817.89, p = .000, \eta^2 = 3.63 \)

Interaction Effect (Group x Question): \( F(3, 3184) = 138.18, p = .000, \eta^2 = .042 \)
This indicates a need for an intervention for each participating school which encourages and trains students to utilise school resources in the event of witnessing others being bullied. Some schools evidently already have protocols which facilitate or support students in this regard. The data presented here provide results which validate the need for peer intervention. As a result of scrutinising these findings, the Peer Advocacy program was refined and further developed as a specific new approach to intervention. The present investigation also indicated that students are willing to report bullying they are aware of to a teacher. Peer Advocacy provides a mechanism for undertaking this task in a way which can be legitimised through school procedures and sanctions. The reporting behaviours of students are a critical dimension of intervention and it is imperative that individual schools devise appropriate and secure reporting mechanisms for bullied students in their milieu. Additionally, peers of bullied students are positive about the capacity of the school to help students feel good and this is an attitude well suited to Peer Advocacy training. Survey results also reveal that all students and bullied students are already willing to offer help to those they saw being bullied. The latter is a positive indicator that the Peer Advocacy intervention would be useful in formalising processes for assisting others. The specific application of Peer Advocacy to bullying intervention evolved as a result of this research which indicates that victims of bullying would seek the help of peers.

Summary

This paper attempts to offer a research base for the development of a theoretical construct for the innovative and highly structured Peer Advocacy intervention. The theoretical basis has been grounded in the original research presented which examined the attitudes, perceptions and inclinations of students in metropolitan Sydney in regard to peer abusive behaviours. Issues related to student perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of bullying, their willingness to report incidents, their confidence in the capacity of the school to support them and their inclination to assist those they saw being bullied revealed close correlations and also significant differences depending on the bullied status of the respondent.
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This provided support for the introduction of the Peer Advocacy intervention which trains non-abusive young people in specific advocacy skills to assist their abused peers. Other relevant theoretical issues are also examined elsewhere in order to uncover the critical factors and relevant constructs underpinning Peer Advocacy. These include the psychology of victimisation, the correlation of peer abuse with child abuse and the identifying characteristics of those involved in the bullying paradigm, all of which support the need for a structured methodology for peer education to provide support for victims through the Peer Advocacy program.
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Abstract

Peer Advocacy is a helping strategy which provides victims of bullying with an individual mentor to assist them in their efforts to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy is an innovative adaptation of the advocacy process successfully employed to support individuals with disability and other community members who seek justice through the aid of knowledgeable and capable others. It is a new approach to intervention in bullying as it requires peers of victims of bullying to accept responsibility for their protection and to commit to structured assistance. Very little will change in the current social responses to bullying and victimisation if this cannot be affected. The theoretical foundation for Peer Advocacy is constructed from both recent original research and an examination of a range of theories not previously considered in relation to bullying. Analysis of data collected in four metropolitan high schools in NSW, sought student opinions on: the seriousness of bullying in their school, their inclination to report bullying they were aware of to a teacher, the capacity of the school to make students feel good about themselves and student willingness to assist others they saw being bullied. Significant differences were found in the attitudes and perceptions of bullied students and the general populations of the schools and between schools. Further, the concept is grounded in theories of advocacy, the psychology of victimization and resilience, social capital and child protection. Each of these can be shown to support the notion that bullied young people can secure the assistance and intervention to which they are entitled by seeking help from trained and trusted peers who then act for and with them in their approaches to authorities. Peer Advocacy comprises specific operational and philosophical principles related to bullying intervention as a responsibility of the peers of victimised individuals. The intervention also specifies processes and procedures which guide the interaction between the advocate and partner, and which require commitment, the acquisition of certain competencies and a mature understanding of the emotional and social support needs of the victim. These structures and processes are fully described in another document and this paper describes the foundations of the intervention.
A Theoretical Construct For Peer Advocacy As A Functional Response to Bullying
Jean B. Healey

Peer Advocacy is grounded in a range of theoretical constructs including those related to the psychology of victimization, child protection issues and representative advocacy. An examination of the relevance of these theoretical perspectives demonstrates the contribution each makes to a strong foundation for the new composite theoretical construct which supports the process of Peer Advocacy. This program represents a new approach to intervention for victims of bullying as it proposes the inclusion of peers in a systematic process which demands a morally and legally conscientious response from those in authority. It necessitates the induction of young people into a training program to develop the attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation and empathy to speak out and secure assistance for individuals who are being hurt through bullying.

Background to the Practice of Advocacy

Advocacy has been accepted in the literature as an established and effective means of providing qualified support for needy individuals in the quest for improved services otherwise denied them as a consequence of their personal incapacities or lack of skills (Ward and Page-Hanify, 1986). Advocacy is proposed in a range of circumstances including advocacy for children who are abused, neglected or exhibiting mental health difficulties or disabilities (Balcazar, 1996; Knitzer, 1996; Paull, 1998; Watkins and Calicut, 1997). It is described as a process whereby a skilled individual acts clearly on the side of a person with disadvantage to ensure their rights and welfare are protected (Stroeve, 1998). It can range from this personal and individualised process to one which advocates support for causes through legislative change (Doueck, Weston, Filbert, Beekhuis, & Redlich, 1997; Shore, 1998; Westman, 1997,) and policymaking (Zirpoli, Wieck, Hancox, & Skarnulis, 1995).
It is also utilised for support for families of individuals with specific needs (Litzelfelner & Petr, 1997; Plunge, Guetschow, Kratochwill, & Gettinger, 1996;) and encouragement of self-advocacy in a wide range of areas of need including learning disability (Aspis 1997; Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes 1997; White, Thompson & Nary, 1997). The impact of the process of advocacy is discussed in terms of positive outcomes for individuals, including satisfaction through participation (Ward and Page-Hanify, 1986) but also as resulting sometimes in stress responses (Doueck, et al 1997; Goodley, 1997). There is a strong tradition of advocacy practice in the field of special education and disability services which provides a substantial framework and foundation for the introduction of Peer Advocacy as a bullying intervention.

Peer Advocacy draws on the successful tradition of having others act on behalf of those in need and applies similar principles and practices to the training of young people to take responsibility for assisting peers who are victims of bullying. Advocacy as a practice has generally involved a partnership between an individual whose needs are not being met because of their inability to advocate for themselves and another individual who has relatively superior power, status, knowledge, ability or skills. However, Peer Advocacy represents a relationship between individuals of like status. Both the Peer Advocate and the victim of bullying are young people whose social status, power, knowledge and capacities are obviously inferior to those from whom they must seek assistance and protection.

In advocacy programs which support individuals with limitations of intellectual, physical or psychological capacities it is essential to select an advocate who can act on their behalf in circumstances where they may otherwise be denied their rights and due processes (Smith & Anton, 1997). Such advocates undertake to obtain justice and services for their partner in situations where particular organisational or procedural intricacies may require the intervention of someone with the necessary skill or knowledge to achieve access to the requisite service (Alper & Schloss, 1996).
Characteristics of Victims, Bullies and Observing Peers

There is a continuum of characteristics exhibited by victims of bullying (Besag, 1992, Olweus, 1993;) and while the personal interaction and response style of a victim may be deemed passive, ineffectual and lacking resilience, they can just as often be assertive and resistant in response to the bullying behaviour. Victims are not necessarily, as is popularly believed, weak and vulnerable individuals incapable of defending themselves against the aggressive demands of the bully. A critical component of victimization is the lack of support, assistance and empathy evident in their peers and others throughout their ordeal (Rigby, & Slee, 1993). Victims are selected on the basis of their perceived passivity and social ineptitude, and in the expectation there will be little resistance. Nevertheless, should they attempt to seek assistance and protection it is often the unsupportive social processes encountered following victimization which further incapacitate the victim. Peer Advocacy provides an alternative voice which can verify the experiences of the victim and appeal for assistance on their behalf when their own efforts are ignored.

Neither are bullies necessarily viewed as aggressive individuals whose pattern of interaction is based on demanding, selfish and destructive behaviours designed to maintain their self esteem at the expense of others'. Society seems to view bullies often as successful leaders in a competitive environment where aggression is a justifiable means to a lucrative and indulged future. (McCarthy, Sheean & Wilkie, 1996). Bullies are described in glowing terms as popular, attractive, having lots of friends, wealth, power and ability (Jenkin, 1999). It is these very characteristics which society so values, and which bullies are so skilled at emulating, which places them in a position to wield such destructive influence over their victims. Less attractive, less popular, less flamboyant and far less socially impressive victims cannot muster support for their complaints against such charismatic individuals. Couple this with the bully’s capacity for deviance whereby the behaviours in question are covertly undertaken, leaving the victim with no evidence of the destructive events and it becomes clear that the victim is unlikely to be able to overcome the social bias as well as the victimization and it is little wonder they often abandon the effort.
The impact on bystanders of observing bullying has to date been discussed in terms of concern for their emotional responses, however it is suggested in this program that ‘bystanders’ be replaced with a paradigm which places observers of bullying within the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVER BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>POSITIVE / HELPFUL</th>
<th>NEGATIVE / HARMFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>verbal and physical assistance to victim; reporting to authorities; expressed disapproval of bullying behaviour</td>
<td>verbal support for bully; prevention of protective intervention by others; expressed approval of bullying behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>remaining in vicinity of victim; mentally noting names of bullies and details of the events</td>
<td>turning away; leaving the vicinity; failing to report; failing to offer verbal &amp; physical assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Matrix of observer responses in witnessing bullying.**

It is clear that observers of bullying incidents are involved to some extent whatever their selected responses. Bystanders cannot be neutral observers of abusive behaviour towards others. They must respond in some way to the incidents observed and the matrix suggests that these responses can be positive or negative in their impact as well as active or passive in their execution. Doing ‘nothing’ is nevertheless responding in a manner which impacts the victim. This could include turning away, leaving the vicinity of the incident and failing to report. This is therefore a passive and negative response to witnessing bullying. Observers who are passive in the sense of not actively engaging in overt behaviour can nevertheless contribute positively by remaining nearby and perhaps mentally noting the details of the incident.
Those bystanders who actively support the bully or prevent protective intervention by others are engaging in negative and harmful behaviours akin to victimisation. The most effective and collaborative role for the observer of bullying is to engage in positive and helpful behaviours such as reporting, offering assistance, expressing disapproval to bullies and help-seeking. Peer Advocacy aims to develop these skills as well as courage and a sense of responsibility in those who witness bullying incidents. This requires training in perspective-taking as well as specific help-seeking skills. Observers of bullying are therefore suitable candidates for the Peer Advocacy program as are other peers who become aware of victimisation. Peer Advocacy relies upon peers of the victimised individual taking responsibility for seeking support and protection on their behalf. Young people are trained to understand and operate the procedures necessary for the victim of bullying to receive a fair hearing from the adults, in particular teachers, with the authority to intervene.

The Peer Advocacy process is an advanced of a generic anti-bullying education program (Healey, unpublished) delivered ideally, within a supportive school community which will respond to appeals for intervention and support. Peer Advocates are expected to put the case for and with their partners to adults whose receptivity and responses reinforce the practice of reporting. In many instances, however, currently schools do not have a supportive or systematic approach to dealing with complaints about bullying. The introduction of the Peer Advocacy is recommended as a component of a comprehensive and customised whole school approach (Healey, 2003).

Theories Contributing to the Development of Peer Advocacy

Over the past decade the use of depersonalising descriptors such as ‘human resources’ and the tendency to consider social issues in terms of economic rationalism rather than interpersonal investment, has resulted in a shift towards functional rather than personal social support and a ‘ideology of exclusion’ (Rees, 1994). It is the perceived lack of investment of interpersonal and other necessary resources which eventually incapacitates the victim and reduces trust.
Peer Advocacy contributes to social capital and therefore to the well being of the broader community by encouraging young people to provide each other with assistance and therefore preventing the additional costs which result from the abandonment of victims of bullying. Through the process, peers have a supportive role in securing the assistance of the wider community and relevant adults in intervening to protect young people from bullying. In relation to the investment, which involves education and training, a ready resource of available individuals to advocate on their own and others’ behalf is created and the social capital gained is disproportionately positive. The underlying theory of the importance of sustaining social capital in an economically rational society (Coleman, 1988) fits well with the production of Peer Advocates at little cost and enormous gain in the effort to eliminate bullying. Coleman also characterises social capital as of mutual benefit to members of a society and as incorporating strong community connections to social institutions such as schools and families. The importance of establishing a more formal advocacy role for peers in this way is proposed as critical to alleviating the negative impact and outcomes of bullying.

The Nature of Victimization

The potential for victimization often results from the social isolation of the target individual in the bullying paradigm and this disconnectedness from a supportive community in turn enables the bully to continue since social isolation facilitates the abuse of young people (Garbarino & Kostelnky, 1992; Tomison & Tucci, 1997). Establishing and maintaining supportive social networks can, on the other hand, equip young people with the resources to seek and access the help they need to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy focuses on increasing the investment of young people in each others’ welfare when supportive adults are not available or not concerned to intervene in what are often regarded as childish ‘disputes’. It is often only with great difficulty that young people are able to convince those with the authority to intervene, that their help is necessary to protect a young person from harm.
Paramount to an understanding of the nature of victimisation in bullying is an understanding of the social forces which appear to reinforce, condone and encourage bullying while ignoring victims’ protestations and cries for help (Byrne, 1994; McCarthy et al., 1996). The characteristics of bullies and their victims seem to contribute to this situation and in a contradictory way may operate in favour of the bully and lead to the abandonment of the victim. Unsupportive observer responses also compound the issue.

Victims are often dismayed at the trivialisation of their ordeal and at the superficial advice offered to avoid the bully or worse still to ensure the bully gets whatever is requested in order to prevent further victimisation. Contact with the bully is often unavoidable and socially engineered such as in age-based classrooms, sporting groups or social activities and travel arrangements over which young people have little control. Victims are therefore in no position to protect themselves from the encounters. Peer Advocates are a means by which the case for the victim can be put to supportive and committed authority figures who have the power to intervene and change the circumstances whereby bullies have unlimited access to their victims. Without the establishment of a structured process however, victims remain at the mercy of bullies and cannot rely on the judgement of adults who may be deceived by the bully’s demeanour. Victimisation then is not the result of bullying but the process of bullying.

Peer Advocacy is proposed as a strategy for intervention which provides victims with an alternative voice through which to defend their right to privacy, security and assistance. The response of the individual to the bullying, whether resilient or not does not reduce the level of victimisation. We need ask, is the individual who resists bullying and seeks assistance to halt the behaviour less victimised than the individual who succumbs emotionally and without resistance to the behaviour? By measuring the impact of the behaviour in terms of the responses of the individuals concerned we may well minimise the responsibility of the bully and the degree of bullying occurring for which intervention is essential. The true measure of the level of victimisation is not then degree of distress evident but the extent and Parameters of behaviours perpetrated against the victim, regardless of their impact.
Fortunately, some victims will respond in a resilient manner which affords them some protection (Healey, 2002) but this does not reduce the level of responsibility of the bully. In this regard the role of the Peer Advocate is more, or less, representative depending upon the capacities of the victim, but the level of victimization should not be assessed on the basis of the assertiveness or otherwise of the response. Peer Advocacy legitimises reporting.

If we consider the conceptualisation of victimization as based upon the competency of the individual to respond in a self-protective manner, we are possibly engaging in a process of re-victimization of the more competent individual. If there is the possibility that intervention will be withheld because of the perception that the victim is ‘coping’ there may be a consequent failure to ensure that bullies are accountable for their behaviour. Should the bully of the most passive victim be held differently accountable to the bully of the more assertive victim? Does the level of competence of the victim responding in a help-seeking and effective manner prescribe a less vigorous intervention than that instituted for the passive victim? There is a real risk that the latter reinforces a passive and dependent response, when an assertive response is preferable in terms of long-term protective behaviours.

The purpose of Peer Advocacy in an anti-bullying program is the establishment of a partnership which teaches a self-protective response to abusive behaviour, not a dependent relationship whereby passivity is reinforced. The processes of access and engagement of the Peer Advocate are in themselves assertive and proactive behaviours required on the part of the victim.

Another factor in the continuation of victimization is an essentially Australian pre-occupation with creating individuals who will not be “dobbers” - an undeniable pre-cursor to the creation of victims of bullying. There is little opportunity afforded young Australians to develop an understanding of the difference between legitimate reporting of incidents which require adult intervention to avoid harm to others and themselves and “dobbing” which is essentially the reporting of insignificant or harmless activities. Young people are discouraged from seeking assistance from those in authority by the responses they receive which clearly indicate that their complaints are not viewed as significant and indeed which may be viewed as unwelcome, unnecessary and despicable.
It may be a misinterpretation of the intent of adults who are concerned with both the individual's welfare and the preparation of them for the challenges of the future, but the net result is the development, over time of passive individuals who may not seek assistance even when it is genuinely needed. This reinforces bullies and creates the unprotected environments in which they flourish.

**Peer Abuse as a Child Protection Issue**

Current social attitudes and responses to peer abuse correlate closely with those evident in child abuse generally including the tendency to discount the incidence and impact of the activity, to maintain the social status and privileges of the perpetrator and to minimize the responsibility and capacity of others to intervene (Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994). Peer Advocacy empowers young people with the knowledge of current legislative protections such as the Children and Young persons (Care and protection) Act, 1998 NSW, to enable them to seek the sanctioning of abusive activities to which they are vulnerable and exposed.

The process enables young people to access the protective provisions already available through legislation for children who are being abused. To date scant attention has been paid to the concept of bullying as a child protection issue (Healey, 2001; Kinard, 1998; Portwood, 1999) and mandatory provisions such as the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act NSW 1998, which could readily be invoked in response to the abuse endured through bullying. Children who are psychologically, physically or emotionally traumatised as a result of bullying are rarely notified according to mandated legislation provisions (Healey, 2001).

However, a careful analysis of the provisions of this Act as well as those currently mandated throughout most western countries, and the regulations imposed by employing bodies would demonstrate that teachers and others must invoke the protective provisions if abuse is suspected, and this should not exclude peer abuse or bullying. Peer Advocacy prepares young people by educating them about their rights to protection under the law as well as the provisions of anti-discrimination, harassment and assault legislation.
In the absence of proactive and responsible authorities, Peer Advocacy empowers young people to act on their own or others' behalf to secure their rights and safety are maintained.

*Peer Advocacy As A Protective Strategy*

Peer Advocacy is a functional response based on specific operational and philosophical principles grounded in advocacy processes. The structure and processes of Peer Advocacy are described elsewhere (Healey, in press). The intervention is incorporated as an advanced component of a broad anti-bullying education curriculum (Healey, unpublished), along with several other interpersonal and personal competencies which include resilience and assertiveness. Peer Advocacy has been designed to provide an appropriate means of partnership for those victims of bullying whose own efforts to secure assistance may have been unsuccessful and is proposed as more relevant and appropriate than several other approaches to peer partnership which are currently popular.

There is a plethora of programs and training packages available now for schools which have been introduced over recent years in an attempt to equip young people with the skills necessary to facilitate the development of mature interpersonal interactions. Many of these approaches are highly successful if appropriately applied and have been responsible for the development of significant and effective skills in formerly naive young people. Peer Advocacy has a specific focus and implementation process which makes it preferable or complimentary to other skills bases for the purpose of intervention in bullying.

Conflict resolution, peer mediation and dispute resolution are some such approaches which are neither relevant nor appropriate for intervention in bullying. While each of these approaches is designed to introduce co-operative skills and deter aggressive interactions between peers, (Beland, 1992, Long, Fabricius, Muscheno, Michael & Palumbo, 1998,) it is their dependence upon the reciprocal nature of disputation and conflict in interactions which makes them unsuitable for bullying intervention.
These approaches are most effective in teaching the skills for resolving situations wherein two protagonists have conflicting needs or desires and are involved in a struggle to assert their own will, usually at the expense of the other. The significant difference with bullying, however, is the lack of reciprocity and the fundamentally abusive characteristics of the interaction. In a conflict, disputation or fight two opposing forces struggle to dominate and establish superiority or satisfy a goal. Bullies and victims are not in dispute, in conflict nor are they in need of mediation. Victims of bullying do not have a particular view, desire or goal which conflicts with the bully’s, rather bullies are determined to inflict their views, desires and goals upon others as a means of demonstrating their superior power or dominance in a given situation. The victim is a target selected as satisfying specific criteria, one of which is the likelihood that there will be no assertive or conflicting view in response. For further clarification, an examination of the criteria which define bullying demonstrates that the key indicators of lack of reciprocity, intention to harm, frequency of the attacks and misuse of social or psychological power (Pikas, 1989; Tattum, 1993;) all indicate an absence of conflict and the unmistakable presence of victimisation. Conflict resolution will not assist victims of bullying who have no wish to engage with the bully particularly in an aggressive and disputational way, and indeed this approach may re-victimise the victim if it appears an attempt is being made to equalise the blame for the inappropriate interactions. Bullies will often minimise their responsibility by claiming to be “fighting” or “playing” with the victim and the intercepting adult or peer will need to be trained to take into consideration the factors mentioned here before determining that the interaction is to be judged as such.

Peer Support strategies can provide young people with foundation skills including empathy and communication, which will assist in the acquisition of Peer Advocacy competencies. The positive and supportive attitudes developed through a peer support program will facilitate the processes and procedures which comprise the Peer Advocacy approach. Peer Advocacy is not proposed as a general skill but as one specifically introduced to provide victims of bullying with an intermediary to put their case to those with the authority and inclination to intervene.
Peer advocates are specifically trained in legislative, human rights and equal opportunity provisions which support their actions.

It is also suggested here that the popular "no-blame" approach (Robinson & Maines, 1997) to intervention has limited applicability, particularly when the abuse is serious and damaging. This is despite documented success in alerting non-abusive peers to the plight of the victim (Sullivan, Cleary & Sullivan, 2003).

Fundamentally, the notion that serious forms of bullying can be effectively addressed without responsibility being taken by the individuals responsible for the abuse has a questionable moral and ethical basis. In situations where the support of peers is sought and the abused individual is listened to, it is, in all probability, the peer support which facilitates recovery, not the lack of blaming. However in more serious cases it is neglectful to ignore the hurtful and damaging behaviour of the bully and to fail to address their inadequacies through remedial and educational strategies and programs. No-blame may well be seen as no responsibility and this is only appropriate in very limited circumstances.

Summary
This paper attempts to offer a research base for the development of a theoretical construct for the innovative and highly structured Peer Advocacy intervention. The theoretical basis has been grounded in original research which examined the attitudes, perceptions and inclinations of students in metropolitan Sydney in regard to peer abusive behaviours. Issues related to student perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of bullying, their willingness to report incidents, their confidence in the capacity of the school to support them and their inclination to assist those they saw being bullied revealed close correlations and also significant differences depending on the bullied status of the respondent. This provided support for the introduction of the Peer Advocacy intervention which trains non-abusive young people in specific advocacy skills to assist their abused peers. Other relevant theoretical issues were also examined in order to uncover the critical factors and relevant constructs underpinning Peer Advocacy.
These included the psychology of victimisation, the correlation of peer abuse with child abuse and the identifying characteristics of those involved in the bullying paradigm, all of which support the need for a structured methodology for peer education to provide support for victims through the Peer Advocacy program.
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New Theoretical Perspectives on Bullying: Broadening our Understanding of the Psychology of Peer Abuse

Jean B. Healey

Abstract

Research into bullying in recent years has focussed primarily on defining its parameters and describing the experiences, attitudes and perceptions of individuals involved in the paradigm. The nature of bullying in terms of frequency, types of behaviours and the characteristics of bullies and victims have been thoroughly explored and reported. We can describe cultural, gender and age-related differences in involvement as well as the impact of the behaviours. What has not been fully addressed in recent times are several psychological components of bullying in young people and this is the focus of the research reported here. As an outcome of analysis of a substantial database of responses from over three thousand high school students several new theoretical perspectives emerged, specifically:

- resiliency as a critical factor in resisting bullying and the practicality of teaching this attribute to victims;
- the notion of Peer Advocacy as a functional response to support victims of bullying is also reviewed and described;
- peer abuse as a correlate of child abuse and the applicability of child protection legislation to the issue is reviewed for the first time;
- and the perception that violence viewing influences young people to engage in violence is challenged.
Fundamentally, it is timely to attempt to extend our understanding of peer abuse beyond descriptive and quantitative analyses to a deeper knowledge of the psychological influences and impact of the phenomenon, utilising new explanations supported by innovative interpretations and reflection. Therefore, additionally a model is presented which differentiates individual intervention for bullies and victims along a continuum and in particular explains the process by which passive victims can be supported to develop resistance, assertiveness and resiliency through a structured program of skill development.
New Theoretical Perspectives on Violence and Bullying in Schools:
Broadening Our Understanding of the Psychology of Peer Abuse

Jean B. Healey

Introduction
This paper describes the emergence of new theoretical perspectives which extend current understandings of bullying in schools. These perspectives emerged over the course of the program of research and intervention which may be seen to challenge current practice and theory in regard to the interpretation and analysis of bullying in schools. The data comprises responses from over three thousand high school students and are described elsewhere but outcomes of the analyses revealed new perspectives briefly articulated in this paper. These include: resiliency as a critical skill for resisting bullying; Peer Advocacy as a functional approach to intervention; peer abuse as a child protection issue and the reassessment of violence viewing as a credible origin of aggressive behaviour.

Resiliency As A Critical Skill For Resisting Bullying
Resiliency is a critical skill for resisting bullying which may be taught to victimised individuals A pedagogical model for simulating the acquisition of the attribute of resiliency, previously considered developmental, emerged in light of data which revealed variations in student capacity to respond effectively to bullying.
Cultural and gender differences in the interpretation of, and tolerance for peer abusive behaviours were also revealed. Victims of bullying or peer abuse do not form an homogeneous group and their capacities to resist the bully differ along a continuum from passivity and surrender to resilience and recovery. (Rutter, 1993) Resilience may be seen as an attribute which is measurable and quantitative and therefore clearly identifiable as a personality and behavioural trait in particular individuals. (Blankenship, 1998; Freitas & Downey, 1998; Gardano, 1998)

There is some discussion in the literature of the notion of protective factors residing within individuals who respond in a more resilient fashion to abusive situations and these include intellect (Carver, 1998), perceived social support (Byrne, 1993), and effective social skills (Doll & Lyon, 1998). Nevertheless, we can assume that the abusive behaviour is just as damaging to these individuals but that they have developed overt responses which offer psychological buffers rather than passive responses which expose them to further incidents of abuse.

This is relevant to intervention in that the emotional responses of the victim must be a paramount consideration and be fully understood and accepted if the victim is to be successful in establishing more effective and assertive responses. Individuals who exhibit resiliency in response to bullying cannot be considered less harmed than individuals who exhibit less effective responses.
However, if ineffective victims can be taught to exhibit more resilient behaviours such as help-seeking, avoidance of the bully or peer advocacy, their experience of bullying may have a reduced effect. Kinard, (1998) points out that the factors which define resilience are sometimes also reported as capacities which lead to the development of resilience. Having good self-regard, for example may indicate resilience is present or it may facilitate the establishment of resilient behaviour where none was previously demonstrated perhaps due to the absence of adversity. This becomes a critical matter in the discussion of responses to, and the impact of bullying. While some children may experience chronic life stressors such as poverty, maltreatment and school failure, others may be exposed to relatively short-term adversity such as bullying. The literature with regard to resilience more often refers to the former circumstance and the plethora of research and discussion on the subject is devoted mainly to the characteristics and indicators of resilience and analysis of the source of such competence given the negative outcomes of abuse which are generally consequent for the child. (Carver, 1998; Wilson and Gottman, 1996;).

Consideration is also given to the effects of abuse on both resilient and non-resilient individuals to determine whether resilience provides protection from distress and the capacity to resist or avoid bullying.

The possibility of teaching resiliency skills to individuals who do not demonstrate a natural psychological capacity to recover from abuse is proposed. The notion that resistance to bullying is not simply an intra- or interpersonal skill, but that it resides within a social milieu, which may well support the abuser is also given credence through the research data.
A Model for Individual Intervention

A comprehensive approach to intervention in bullying in schools has been described (Healey, 2003) whereby research-based policy development, teacher in-servicing, whole school commitment and generic anti-bullying or other anti-violence strategies, as well as individual interventions for bullies and victims are employed to reduce the likelihood of effective bullying. The appended figure describes an individual intervention for victims as part of the comprehensive approach needed in schools. The model depicts the progress of the victim along the coping and resistance continuum as an outcome of a specific program which includes resiliency training, and which is delivered within a supportive environment. Figure 1 illustrates the gradual development of skills by the victim as an effective response to bullying. This follows the application of a research-based intervention program, delivered in an environment committed to bullying prevention through the provision of supports. It also describes the relative positions of the protagonists.

The model has been devised to illustrate the outcomes of an intervention which takes account of the factors discussed so far and which is intended to assist in the development of effective resistance to bullying. It illustrates progress along a continuum towards effective and appropriate peer interaction behaviours for victims of bullying. The victim may enter the paradigm exhibiting passive and ineffective responses to their victimisation. There is a tendency to believe that victims are always weak and ineffectual individuals mercilessly tormented by dominant bullies.
This perception needs to be challenged if effective interventions are to be developed. The capacities of victims cover a wide spectrum of behaviours some of which are less assertive and effective than others, but which cannot all be classified as passive. The purpose of the intervention is to enable victims to eventually normalise relations towards neutral co-existence as a peer of the bully.

**Peer Advocacy As A Functional Response To Bullying Intervention**

Advocacy has been accepted in the literature as an established and effective means of providing qualified support for needy individuals in the quest for improved services otherwise denied them as a consequence of their personal incapacities or lack of skills (Ward and Page-Hanify 1986). Advocacy is proposed in a range of circumstances including advocacy for children who are abused, neglected or exhibiting mental health difficulties or disabilities (Balcazar, 1996; Knitzer, 1996; Paull, 1998; Watkins and Callicut, 1997) It is described as a process whereby a skilled individual acts on behalf of a person with disadvantage to ensure their rights and welfare are protected (Stroeve, 1998). The impact of the process of advocacy is discussed in terms of positive outcomes for individuals including satisfaction through participation (Ward et al), but also stress (Doueck, 1997; Goodley, 1997)
There is a strong tradition of advocacy practice in the field of special education and disability services which provides a substantial framework and foundation for the introduction of Peer Advocacy as a bullying intervention in schools. The specific application of Peer Advocacy to bullying intervention also evolved as a result of research which indicates that victims of bullying will seek the help of peers (Rigby & Slee, 1993) and that they hold unfavourable views of the capacity and willingness of teachers to assist them when complaints about bullying are made (Healey, Dowson & Bowen 2003). The elevated social status of bullies and the fact that peers were in general unsympathetic towards victims was also revealed in the research data. From this, the concept and processes of Peer Advocacy developed and the social imperative of using this specific strategy to address peer abuse unfolded. The critical factor in peer abuse or bullying is obviously peer attitudes and behaviours and the most potent intervention is therefore, of necessity peer-focused. Peer Advocacy is a functional new response which may be taught to peers of victims as an intervention in bullying. It is a helping strategy which provides victims of bullying with an individual mentor to assist them in their efforts to resist bullying. Peer Advocacy is an innovative adaptation of the advocacy process which has more often been employed to support individuals with disability and other community members who seek justice through the aid of knowledgeable and capable others. It is a new approach to intervention in bullying as it recognises that without the acceptance and assistance of peers for the problems faced by victims of bullying, very little will change in the current social responses to bullying and victimisation.
The processes of Peer Advocacy are described elsewhere (Healey, 2002) and are based on specific operational and philosophical principles related to bullying intervention. Peer Advocacy proposes the inclusion of peers in a systematic process which demands a morally and legally conscientious response from those in authority. It necessitates the induction of young people into a training program to develop the attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation and empathy to speak out and secure assistance for individuals who are being hurt through bullying. Peer Advocacy draws on the successful tradition of having others act on behalf of those in need and applies similar principles and practices to the training of young people to take responsibility for assisting peers who are victims of bullying.

**Peer Abuse As A Child Protection Issue**

Under-reporting of all forms of child abuse is an international phenomenon notwithstanding mandatory procedures present in most western nations (O'Toole, Webster, O'Toole & Lual 1999) and Asia (Lau, J., Liu, J., Yu, A., & Wong, C. 1999). The declaration of the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act NSW 1998 extended the legal obligations of teachers for mandatory notification to include all forms of child abuse. However, despite the specific wording of the legislation that “all institutions responsible for the care and protection of children provide an environment for them that is free of violence and exploitation” (chapter 2, article 8 a & b) the issue of peer abuse has not been considered for inclusion.
Further, the Act states that a child or young person is at risk of harm, when
"the child or young person’s physical or psychological needs are not being
met or are at risk of not being met" (chapter 3(23))
Nevertheless, there is little research or evidence that peer abuse is
recognised as a form of child abuse nor that legal provisions are use in this
way to protect children. The conceptualisation of bullying as a child
protection issue and the possibility of using current legislation as a
protective intervention emerged as bullying behaviours were revealed to
correlate closely with commonly described child abusive behaviours. In
terms of the types of behaviours endured, their intensity, frequency and
psychological impact, peer abuse can readily be shown to parallel child
abuse as defined in the legislation and the literature (Ambert, 1998;
Portwood, 1999; Roscoe, 1990.). The non-accidental nature of the injuries,
the power relationships between the victim and perpetrator though not as
obvious between peers, the threats of harm and demands for secrecy, which
characterise peer victimisation, equate to child abuse on all levels of
analysis. Ambert suggests that peer abuse is seen to differ from other forms
of abuse on three key factors: the age of the perpetrator, formal power
dimensions on which child abuse can be identified and analysed
comprising: type of abuse, severity, frequency, developmental stage
interventions and perpetrators. Peer abuse can be measured and analysed on
each of these dimensions providing a comprehensive picture of its similar
eaetiology to other forms of child abuse.
Peer abuse corresponds with child abuse across types, severity and impact as the data referred to here demonstrated.

The survey responses of students with regard to their experiences of behaviours identified in the current literature as typical of bullying were analysed. The behaviours were similar to those listed in the child abuse literature as typical of the behaviours endured by children and young people during abuse. Interpretation of the results of data gathered for this research program, in conjunction with the child abuse literature exposed the close correlation between the two sets of experiences. As an outcome, the concept of applying the child protection legislation to the provision of protection to students in bullying or peer abusive situations emerged as a possibility. This, however, has not been acknowledged in the recent literature. Few references exist to support the proposal that the legislation devised in Australia and most other Western nations to protect children from abuse is also highly applicable in the case of peer abuse. Child protection legislation however can be extended to include peer abuse as a child protection issue under this new initiative.

**Challenging The Perception That Violence Viewing Influences Young People To Engage In Violence**

Violence viewing is commonly reported as a precipitous factor in the development of aggressive behaviour (Bjornebekk, 1998; Biggins, 1997).
However it is proposed here that for the most part, previous research has been erroneous in suggesting that violence viewing is causal and instructive in the development of aggression. It is an important conceptualisation since violent and bullying behaviours must be attributed to other origins if violence viewing is eliminated as a cause.

Despite a prevailing community perception that viewing violence influences young people to engage in violent behaviour, (Arnow, 1995; Ballard, 1995; Irwin & Goss, 1995) attempts to establish a causal link between the types and amount of violence viewed and the consequent behaviour of young viewers have been unimpressive. Evidence of such a clear link would provide a ready solution for preventing violent behaviour. While violence viewing contributes nothing positive to the social and moral development of young people nor can it be blamed for precipitating violent behaviours despite sometimes-excessive viewing. A more parsimonious approach is to examine the social and psychological buffers which seem to protect most young people from violent media images and assist them in sustaining acceptable non-violent behaviours. Evidently there are strong mitigating factors at work in society and in particular in the world of young people which ensures that despite regular exposure to on-screen violence they most often choose socially acceptable behaviour. Failure to differentiate real from simulated violence in experimental, observational and analytical studies lies at the foundation of this mistaken belief. The notion of ‘modelling’ aggressive and violent behaviours can be traced back to Bandura (1973) in his observational experiments of young children exposed to simulated violence.
It cannot be extrapolated from observations of `pretend' violence however, that children would similarly copy real adult violence and indeed they rarely do (Heuseman & Bachrach, 1986).

Children who observe or are witnesses to domestic or socially violent adult behaviour (ie. real violence towards real people) generally become and remain traumatised as would be expected. (Roberts, 1998; Spatz-Widom, 1995). Simulated violence is not violence. Violent behaviour is behaviour selected by an individual in order to inflict damage, harm or injury on another person or property. The reality and intention of the act are critical to the definition. If there is no real harm, hurt or damage there has been no real violence. Violent simulations -unless enacted to be threatening or harmful-do not satisfy the definition. The vast majority of young people in our society are effectively immunised against the impact of violence viewing through the consistent influence of pro-social experiences and expectations. There are others who have developed a psychological or personal preference for violence and are likely to select violent viewing to reinforce their world view as well as for entertainment, (Lefkowitz, 1977). It is nevertheless inaccurate to suggest that such media exposure is harmful or instructive for the greater population of viewers. Given that millions of young people daily watch on-screen `violence' in a variety of forms such as cinema, videos and computer games without exhibiting violence it must be acknowledged that current socialisation processes are effective and powerful.
Young people have usually already been exposed to well-established inhibiting social mores and values for a long period before they begin viewing media violence, and it would seem these provide the buffers necessary to assist them in differentiating what is promoted on screen as acceptable from what is actually acceptable to the people who are important to them.

Further the issue of ‘desensitisation’ to violence is suggested as an outcome of exposure to media violence. While de-sensitisation to media violence may well result in young people seeking more and more graphic depictions of simulated violence it has not been established that this leads to desensitisation in those enduring or witnessing real life violence. Again, the great majority of young people are still sympathetic, anxious and afraid when real and even simulated violence is observed (Buckingham, 1997; Cantor, 1997; Ramsden, 1997; Van der Voort & Beentjes, 1997;). Mollier (1994); expresses the concern that exposure to media violence desensitises children to real life aggression and Levine (1995) quotes numerous studies which have shown that media violence encourages aggression and desensitisation. Ageback (1997), on the other hand, states that “evidence proving familiarisation with media violence leads to indifference towards violence in real life, is yet to be unveiled.” The cognitive learning process is still the most credible explanation for the acquisition of violent behaviour since exposure to media models does not provide the consistency or immediacy of familial or social contact and reinforcement.
By reducing the reliance on media as a blameworthy instrument in the
development of violent and bullying behaviours, other intra-personal
origins must be sought.

Summary
This document describes briefly several new perspectives in the
interpretation and analysis of the bullying paradigm. The perspectives arose
from the analysis of data gathered for a large investigation of bullying in
Australian high schools. The perspectives can contribute to an
understanding of the psychology of bullying and bullying victimisation and
inform interventions. The concept of resiliency as a critical skill for
individuals to acquire is illustrated in the model presented. The process of
Peer advocacy is described in detail elsewhere (Healey, 2001) as a generic
curricular intervention for all students. The application of child protection
legislation to peer abuse is an innovative, pragmatic and non-adversarial
solution to the bullying issue. Reassessment of the impact of media
violence on the behaviour of children is also important in assisting to
refocus intervention. These perspectives are offered as innovative
interpretations of familiar information and as such may contribute to the
formulation of new theory.
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COPING WITH VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS

A Comprehensive Approach to the Management of Violent Behaviours

JEAN B. JENKIN

University of Western Sydney, Macarthur

This paper addresses the need for a comprehensive and proactive response to increased concern in schools for the levels of interpersonal violence currently evident. Developed over a number of years and recently trialled with school personnel, the approach described ensures that all members of the school community commit to resolving violence through education.

Current media interest, as well as government inquiries, recent funds allocation and discussion at all levels of society centre on the apparent 'upsurge' of violence particularly in schools. It must be stated at the outset that more confusion than clarity exists on this issue and that any discussion ought to be informed by documented and systematic research. It is abundantly clear that shortcomings in effective data collection, resistance to the documentation of incidents and unnecessary focus on a small number of serious incidents have contributed to a distorted picture of life in Australian schools. While problems of interpersonal violence within schools are evident, it is nevertheless also apparent that schools function effectively and successfully for the most part. The underlying belief which has prompted the development of the "Coping with Violence in Schools" approach, is that all members of the school and wider community must examine their contribution to the problem and take responsibility for prevention. In examining the issue, it is not appropriate to attribute blame to one group - usually students. Adults within the school community and the wider community must begin to assume greater responsibility for supervision, support, direction and management of school-aged persons, and to indicate through their own behaviours a rejection of violence as a solution to problems.

The "COPING WITH VIOLENCE" approach developed from the fundamental belief that all members of the school community need to make a commitment to non-violence and that this should be recorded in formal policy, reflected in practice and evident through evaluation. It has been somewhat controversial in recent months for the author to suggest that violence in schools may not be entirely attributable to the students. Nevertheless, it is self-evident that a non-violent philosophy and practice must be accepted by students, parents, teachers, executive and all other contributing community members if a genuine attempt is to be made to cope with violence in school.

Adopting the strategies incorporated into the "Coping with Violence" programme reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members and reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale for all. It also demonstrates a willingness to address the unequal power relationships between parties and to ensure that all concerned have their legitimate physical, psychological and emotional needs met in a safe nurturing and predictable environment.

Statistical information regarding the incidence of violence in schools is incomplete, fragmented and scant. (Schools Australia 1992 - ATU submission 1993). Nevertheless it seems, on the surface, to indicate an increased involvement of students in violent incidents. Weatherburn (1993 - Institute of Criminology) assures us that only 0.04% of students are ever involved in violent incidents, but the number of recorded offences in N.S.W. increased 71.5% between 1986 - 92 (Schools Aust. 1992). During the first half of 1993 a reported 59 incidents of school violence occurred (Youth Violence 1993). However, teachers in Western Sydney,
when consulted about this figure enquired "which school, on which day " reported the 59 incidents - evidently a major indication of under reporting. This problem is acknowledged both here and overseas - the U.S. National Institute of Education reports that "two thirds of all school crime" is not officially reported. (School Safety 1993) - mainly because of the negative publicity such reporting brings and the consequent loss of school status, students and staff that follows. It is clear that some decision must be made at the macro-system level to protect and support schools who report violent incidents, and that an efficient, confidential and cumulative mechanism needs to be established to facilitate research into the problem. At present the statistics that are recorded in N.S.W. are inflated due to the fact that all incidents on school grounds are included, not just those involving school students, nor those occurring in school hours. (Youth Violence, 1993).

The information is an inaccurate reflection therefore, of the true incidence of what could reasonably be termed "Violence in schools". Some definition of the term needs to be stated and for the purpose of determining the severity of the problem of violence in schools the definition should confine itself to these parameters:

"Violence in schools refers to violent, assaultive or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or school community members with each other, or with school property, and which occurs within normally accepted school hours and within normally accepted school boundaries and situations".

(Jenkins 1993)

The Australian Teachers Union (1993) suggests a similar definition:

"Violence in schools is present in any situation where a member of the school community (teacher, student, other education worker, parent, or visitor) is intimidated, abused, threatened, or assaulted or their property deliberately damaged by another member of that community or the public in circumstances arising out of their activities in a school".

If these definitions were used, it could be readily shown that the level and incidence of violence in schools is remarkably low.

This definition specifically excludes acts of violence which occur outside these normally accepted bounds, situations and times, or which represent acts perpetrated against the school by persons outside the school community. In particular, it cannot be argued that community based gangs who enter school premises during or outside school hours to engage in acts of violence or vandalism should be represented in the statistics or definition of "school violence". This type of violence has its origins in the community and is a community responsibility - schools are merely the victims. Just as 'domestic violence' would not include intruders who entered a home to commit acts of violence, so this definition confines itself specifically to the interactions between school members, in the school environment during school hours.

Schools need to delineate categorically the parameters of their responsibility. Media reports which refer to "schoolboy" crimes often fail to clarify whether in fact the crime occurred within school hours, school grounds or during school based supervision. Indeed, the reference to "school" in many reports merely reflects the child's age (which will obviously be 'school-age') and it is somewhat mischievous of the media to continue to insinuate that all criminal or violent acts perpetrated by children are in some way linked to "school". - their after-hours misdemeanors have little or nothing to do with the function of the school. Therefore it would seem appropriate for schools to determine the extent of their supervisory responsibilities and to state these. For example, travel by public transport to and from school may not be viewed as requiring school supervision. 'Gang' conflicts outside school grounds; even between students of the school are probably beyond the jurisdiction of school authority, and certainly acts of violence or criminal behaviour engaged in after school hours, even if students are still in school uniform, are probably the responsibility of the community, not the school. Since a good deal of confusion seems to exist in this regard, it is important to record the agreed parameters for public scrutiny.
Further, some examination of the corporate culture of schools is likely to reveal policy and processes which in certain circumstances reinforce and maintain violent interaction patterns. A belief that older students require less supervision may be unfounded as students engage in violent behaviour during unsupervised periods. Teachers whose preferred management style is authoritarian, hostile or excessively punitive are likely to escalate rather than defuse potentially violent situations. It is also possible that the image of female teachers as subordinate to male executive, as vulnerable and dependant on supportive intervention, is maintained through school structures. Female teachers in particular, need to be seen as effectively managing behaviour and demanding appropriate responses from students, if their sexual victimization is to be halted.

In determining an appropriate response to the management of violence in schools, a multifaceted and comprehensive approach is desirable. The "Coping with Violence" workshops presented over the past few years (Jenkin & Bowie 1993) represent an amalgamation of educative theory and practice with social welfare concepts. The approach involves all members of the school community and will be thoroughly described in the text "Resolving Violence Through Education - A Handbook for Schools" (Jenkin 1994).

"COPING WITH VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS"

The approach comprises four parts each of which represents a comprehensive methodology for informing and skilling participants in non-violent response options and attitude development.

**PART A** Strategies for School Personnel

**PART B** Structuring a Policy for a Non-violent School

**PART C** ResolVE 1 - Anti-violence Curriculum for primary and secondary students

**PART D** Intervention for identified or potentially violent students.

In **PART A**, all professional members of the school including teachers, executive, administrators, assistants and support personnel receive thorough in-service training which examines the school's responsive and preventative readiness. Participants develop individual skills and strategies while contributing to the overall corporate structure or re-structure. This part of the programme comprises several modules (see list appended) which are delivered over twelve hours of in-service instruction. Modules cover perceptions and origins of violence with background information related to statistics, as well as intervention strategies at the organizational and interpersonal levels. A comprehensive needs analysis is incorporated to facilitate the mobilization of resources and efforts in the areas of greatest need within the particular school.

**PART B** - In this part of the programme, all members of the school community including parents and students, are involved in the development of an active policy of non-violence. This is in contrast to the passive model which sees policy measured in pages length. The active policy approach incorporates evaluation measures which will reflect changes in the day to day conduct of school members at all levels. In particular this part addresses key considerations related to

- the philosophical aims and mission of the policy
- the recruitment, training and support of appropriate personnel
- development of relevant and specific programmes including curricular, responsive and preventative programmes
- an examination of organizational structures as they impact on implementation, monitoring and review of the processes used
- a discussion of resources acquisition and deployment.
This part of the programme is seen then as a blueprint for progress,

In PART C, the ResolVE Curriculum (Resolving Violence through Education) is introduced as a generic programme of information and skills for coping with violence, applicable to primary and secondary students. The curriculum has been specifically devised to address gender differences in the experience of violence, an area that has been ignored or neglected in previous curricula, particularly those developed overseas. The format for presentation follows a partially segregated delivery mode, with several modules presented to integrated groups of males and females and others having them separated. (see list appended).

PART D has been specifically devised to assist students who already manifest violent behaviours or who are identified as potentially violent. The focus of this part of the approach is to develop individualized academic, behavioural and social skills programmes through the systematic application of resolution strategies and instructional goals. Two main features of this part are the ResolVE II curriculum (see list appended) and the Suspension Support methodology. It is suggested that students who qualify for inclusion in this part will probably manifest behaviours which place them at risk of suspension and often repeated suspension. The methodologies employed acknowledge that some instruction needs to be available to such students to facilitate the development of a more appropriate repertoire of behaviours. A thorough programme of intervention pre-suspension, during in-school suspension and as support after school suspension, also needs to be applied in order to reflect a remedial rather than punitive orientation to the procedure. The curriculum offers individuals the opportunity to discuss behaviours they engage in which may be the triggers to trouble in the classroom, and instructs them in goal setting and self-monitoring through the Focus Journal. An improved prognosis for success in the classroom is anticipated if the student attempts to reform are acknowledged by teachers and some re-examination of teacher responses is undertaken.

Fundamental to the implementation of this approach is an acceptance by teachers and school administrators that responding to violence is part of the role of the teacher. Many teachers do not accept that behaviour management and programme development is part of their brief, they view this development of appropriate behaviours as a family responsibility. As long as their view prevails, we will have major and increasing problems of violence in schools.

While the impact of home and family life as well as media and peer influences cannot be ignored, teachers cannot renege on their responsibility to teach children how to behave in school. It is pointless to attempt to deliver well-planned content lessons to students who do not possess the most basic skills which will equip them for learning - attending, accepting and responding in class. Pre-service teacher education must begin to emphasise the importance of exceptional interpersonal interactions and skills as the essence of good teaching.
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Abstract
Bullying in schools has become a major educational issue of concern to teachers, students and parents in the new millennium. As evidence mounts of the destructive, pervasive and at times lethal impact of the phenomena within the education milieu it has become apparent that an approach which comprises a pragmatic, comprehensive intervention, informed by new and innovative theoretical and psychological perspectives, is urgently required. This paper describes an attempt to address this requirement through the Macarthur Model for intervention in bullying in schools customised to address local issues and needs, based on data collected at the specific location.

The first component of the Model involves an initial investigation of the parameters of bullying in the setting using the School Safety Survey adapted and developed for use in this research. The instrument yields substantive baseline data related to student perceptions, experiences and attitudes in relation to bullying in the school.

The next five components of the model are initiated on the basis of the data collected in the educational setting and should be applied simultaneously and progressively to ensure efficacy.

The second component involves identifying and delivering staff development needs and training and the appropriate focus of community education programs; this component provides the opportunity to for the school community to examine their own data and begin to develop customised products and processes;

The third component facilitates the development of a specific school policy based on the levels, types and locations of the bullying reported in the setting;

The fourth component involves the school in determining the level, focus and types of organisational restructuring required to address the issues of student safety and supervision raised in survey responses for the particular setting;

The fifth component involves schools implementing generic, widely applied curricula for the general student population to provide education in regard to origins, indicators and appropriate responses to bullying at the school;

the sixth component involves assisting teachers to address the psychological needs of individuals involved in the bully/victim paradigm, including the acquisition, through training, of personal attributes to facilitate resistance and resiliency to bullying.

Analyses of the evidence gathered in a range of educational settings in which bullying was present provided the structure for the model and revealed several insights into the psychological bases of the phenomenon. The fundamental thesis presented here is that schools have the capacity to effectively intervene in bullying utilising the structured and customised Model described in this paper.
It is the very characteristics which society so values, and which bullies are so skilled at demonstrating, which places bullies in a position to wield such destructive influence over their victims. A substantial commitment of time and resources is required to achieve the philosophical and pragmatic shifts necessary to secure change to the bullying behaviours evident across the social spectrum.

**Previous Interventions**

There has been a wealth of interventions developed internationally to address bullying in schools. For example, an approach described as P.E.A.C.E. (Policy, Education, Action, Coping, Evaluation) (Slee, 1996a and b), has been attempted, which incorporates several of the key of the approach described in this paper, as components in an educational application to address bullying in Australian schools. The P.E.A.C.E pack provides schools with information on how to raise awareness, develop policy and work with children. Results have been supportive with reports of reductions of at least 25% in bullying in schools utilising the intervention, as well as increased awareness and knowledge about bullying. Similarly, the Sheffield project addressed “whole school policy, curriculum work, work in playgrounds and work with individual pupils and small groups involved in bullying situations” (Smith, 1997 p. 68).

This intervention focussed strongly on policy development and implementation, with the other components offered as optional extras. This has been identified as one of the more effective interventions with a recent evaluation indicating 29% of participant schools had developed a separate whole school policy and 58% addressed bullying specifically in welfare and discipline policies (Smith and Madsen, 1997).

Sullivan reports on the New Zealand anti-bullying initiative ‘Kia Kaha’ produced by the NZ police force. Based on the Maori tradition meaning to ‘be strong’, the resource kit was provided to late primary and early secondary students, which is a prime target group for such interventions. In his analysis of the program, Sullivan (1998) points out a long held myth regarding bullies—that they will surrender in the face of opposition, which appears to be proposed in the program. On the contrary, bullies are keen to engage in aggressive interactions and would often welcome a further opportunity to dominate and harm the resistant victim. Although resiliency is a critical skill to learn in response to bullying (Healey, 2001) it does not involve stoically putting up with the victimisation nor being lured into a reciprocal fight. Sullivan supports this view and calls for revision of the program with an emphasis on shared responsibility.

Rigby (2003), in his definitive meta-evaluation of early bullying interventions found that, "The commitment of a school to a program and strong involvement by staff in its implementation appears to be an important and possibly crucial factor in reducing bullying" (page 3). He reports on a range of international interventions each of which comprises a number of components, with mixed effectiveness. Indeed in some instances increases in bullying behaviour was reported as an outcome. The Toronto Study implemented by Pepler (1993) was devised to operate at four levels: the community, whole school, each classroom and individual students.
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Introduction
Bullying has become a major focus of concern for a wide range of social organisations partly as a result of the costs incurred for failure to provide supportive, safe environments for members of the relevant community. Some social institutions, organisations and professions currently demonstrate a commitment to dealing with the bullying affecting their sector through the development of a range of approaches, specific programs and interventions. The range of policy, training, curricular and individual intervention mechanisms and initiatives developed in Australia and overseas require an enormous commitment of resources but often their effectiveness has not been evaluated. Given that bullying behaviours may have their origins in individual psychology and social pathology, it is appropriate for the wider community to take responsibility for intervention in the bullying behaviours of young people beyond the school gate, as indeed some social institutions have accepted

Paramount to an understanding of the nature of victimisation in bullying is an understanding of the social forces which appear to reinforce, condone and encourage bullying while ignoring victims (Byrne, 1994). The potential for victimisation often results from the social isolation of the target individual in the bullying paradigm and this disconnectedness from a supportive community in turn enables the bully to continue (Monaghan-Blout, 1996). Since social isolation facilitates the abuse of young people (Garbarino 1996; Tomison, 1996), establishing and maintaining supportive social networks can equip young people with the resources to seek and access the help they need to resist bullying.

Additionally, the continuation of the bullying behaviour in a climate which endorses it, inevitably leads to further costs. Stress, absenteeism, litigation and the incapacitation of victims through psychological damage, all deplete social capital as well as adding to the financial costs of any organisation. (De Maria, 1996; Mann 1996; Lennane, 1996) During childhood and often into adulthood, individuals who have been severely victimised by bullies require additional social, medical and legal resources which could be avoided if early intervention was offered when the bullying was first identified. However, as with untreated health and ecological deficits, the postponement of intervention leads to gradually increasing service requirements for recovery or remediation.

Often, society seems to view bullies as successful leaders in a competitive environment where aggression is a justifiable means to secure a good future. Bullies are described by young people in glowing terms as popular, attractive, having lots of friends, wealth, power and ability (Healey, 2002).
A peer conflict - mediation program was introduced as well as increased supervision by teachers and some curricular intervention. Nevertheless, the results were seen as disappointing with more children reporting bullying after the intervention. This could indicate a greater awareness and capacity to identify bullying which is an important step to reduction. However, conflict mediation which served as a basis for Pepler’s intervention has been criticised as an inappropriate methodology for use in bullying intervention since bullying is not reciprocal conflict and the participants are not equivalently culpable as is the case in fighting or conflict situations (Healey 1999). Sullivan (1998) also remarks on the Cool Schools (Cool Schools, 1994) project in New Zealand which utilises a conflict-resolution strategy for students in relation to bullying intervention. Although there can be no doubt about the effectiveness of teaching students peer mediation and conflict resolution skills for use in their daily interactions, these are not appropriate methodologies for addressing the abusive and dominant behaviours of bullies within the unequal power relationship that characterises the bullying paradigm. Just as conflict resolution would not be deemed an appropriate response in abusive spousal relationships, nor can it be seen as appropriate for dealing with the abuse of young people by their dominant peers. Nevertheless, there does not appear to be a structured, systematic, widely applicable approach which offers the requisite foundation philosophies and strategies to ensure efficacy.

The Model presented here seems to satisfy these requirements. The components are equally applicable in a broad range of community organizations and non-education settings including workplaces and social organisations where proximity of personnel provides the milieu for bullying. The six components presented here are widely relevant and have emerged as essential to efficacy. When delivered in schools, the intervention is reliant upon their capacity and willingness to establish and maintain preventative and proactive strategies within the limitations of their resources, structures and responsibilities.

While most of the institutions and organisations examined have addressed some of the requisite components, few have addressed all in a systematic and comprehensive manner. It is apparent, nevertheless, that it is the combined impact of the components of the Macarthur Model that is the key indicator for successful intervention. In particular, the definitive factor differentiating this Model is the research - based customised application. Few organisations have attempted to determine the parameters of bullying in their sector prior to the implementation of crisis, conflict resolution, punitive or other responsive interventions, nor to establish the efficacy of such responses when delivered in isolation. Generally speaking, then each of the components of the Macarthur Model of intervention described here may be evident individually in a range of social organisations responsible for managing bullying in the broader community, yet none has established the full Macarthur Model recommended. Underpinning the model are several theoretical perspectives which locate the bullying paradigm within individual psychology but intervention within the realm of responsibility of both the individual and the community.
Individual resiliency for example, is indicated in the capacity of victims of bullying to emerge from the abusive experience with increased skills (Masten, Best and Garmezy 1990) differentiate resiliency on three separate dimensions: positive outcomes despite experiencing high risk environments, competent functioning in the face of acute and chronic life stressors and recovery from trauma. Children who are able to ‘function within normal or acceptable bounds on measures of competence with respect to behavioural, social and/or cognitive functioning’ despite adverse experiences are also identified as resilient (Kinard, 1998; Healey, 2001 b). Further, peer abuse can be viewed as child abuse (Ambert, 1995; Healey, 2000) and current child protection legislation may be utilised to address the ongoing harmful behaviours. This proposal for protective intervention is rarely discussed in the current literature.

Nevertheless there is an upsurge in litigation and applications for apprehended violence orders between victims and bullies (Coates 2001) and this seems to indicate the need for alternative legal interventions. Peer Advocacy (Healey, 2001 a) is another perspective to emerge in recent research by this author as sympathetic attitudes and supportive responses of peers witnessing bullying need to be established and mobilised.

Key Components of the Macarthur Model for Intervention in Bullying in Schools

The Macarthur Model for Intervention in Bullying in Schools was developed over a lengthy period of investigation and comprises six key components which can structure, guide and facilitate a whole school response to this pervasive problem. The critical factor is the comprehensiveness of the approach which will determine long term positive outcomes.

This paper describes the application of the Model in educational organisations, where it has been developed and implemented with some success. Schools have a pivotal role in addressing issues of bullying through a comprehensive intervention which provides access to knowledge, skills and feedback to assist students and schools to recognise, resist and respond appropriately to bullying. Ideally, a systems approach should be established whereby each component is required of individual schools within a supportive macro-system of education. This level of commitment and service delivery is yet to be considered, however. The Macarthur Model of intervention in bullying in schools comprises the following components:

Component 1 Determining the Nature and Parameters of Bullying

This involves the application of the School Safety Survey a questionnaire designed to elicit demographic data such as age, gender and cultural background and responses from the student population with regard to issues in bullying. These include their experiences of nine identified bullying behaviours, (Smith et al 1999, Rigby & Slee, 1998) their preferred or recommended source of support, locations where they believe students feel unsafe, and the descriptions or names of bullied and bullying individuals.

This component is pre-requisite to all other components of the Model as the data provides the research basis for the subsequent intervention.
Component 2 Training for School and Community Personnel

An understanding of the origins, indicators and impact of bullying is essential to effective intervention (Olweus, 1993). It is therefore necessary for the school to commit to in-servicing to provide the background information and strategies required to ensure bullying is addressed. Often the data reveal students’ perceptions about teachers’ capacity and willingness to intervene in bullying and offer indications for a focus in training. During the training program, members of the school community are given access to the preliminary analysis of their own data.

Component 3 Policy Development for the setting

Policy development is a critical inclusion in the intervention and the participants are assisted to devise policy which is based on their own data and which reflects the following essential factors:

- **Collaboration**: the policy must be written collaboratively by all members of the school community to whom it will apply. This is done in a structured manner as described further.
- **Accessibility**: the policy must be made available to all members of the school community in language and format that makes it readily accessible.
- **Applicability**: the policy must be written in such a way that it is clearly applicable to all members of the school community including teachers and parents who must be seen to model appropriate behaviours (Smith & Barajas, 1988)
- **Specificity**: the policy should leave no doubt whatsoever about
  - a) the specific behaviours expected of all members of the school community with regards to their responsibilities for supporting, protecting, helping and advocating for victims of bullying; reporting, resisting, and refusing to participate in bullying;
  - b) their rights to safety, security, support and intervention as necessary

Component 4 Organisational Restructuring

The school data reveal substantial information about the locations, times and perpetrators of bullying in the school. Issues related to supervision, movement about the school, unmonitored areas of the school environment where bullying is most likely to occur and the behaviour of individuals all need to be addressed if the intervention is to truly be comprehensive. These are often the most difficult decisions to make but those which also have the greatest impact with regards to efficacy in reducing bullying.

Component 5 Generic Curricula

Students require similar information to staff and other community members with regard to the origins, impact and indicators of bullying and violence in their social milieu. A specific curriculum designed to impart the information and skills necessary to identify and resist such behaviour need to be implemented for all students. One such curriculum has been produced and is available internationally as “Resolving Violence—an Anti-Violence Curriculum for Secondary Students” (Jenkin, 1996).

Alternatively a specific anti-bullying program needs to be developed to provide the instruction and information required to support peers as advocates.
The introduction of Peer Advocacy (Healey, 2002) as an intervention which teaches peers the specific skills needed to effectively support victims is also a suitable program for students.

**Component 6 Individual Intervention**

Individual interventions, which address the psychological and social, needs of the bully and the victim also form an essential component of the Model. Systematic attention needs to be paid to those students who do not demonstrate a natural propensity for social competence and to broadening the repertoire of protective behaviours young people have to draw on in difficult situations. Victims of bullying are often seen as passive and ineffectual, however other explanations must be explored to interpret their responses to bullies. Often it is an unsupportive environment within which they are forced to function that provides the access and indifference which facilitates bullying; it may be a lack of resiliency (Healey, 2002; Rutter 1998) or the immense psychological impact of the abuse which determines their responses.

All of these matters need to be addressed in individual interventions with victims. With regard to bullies, their inability to be introspective or reflective about the impact of their behaviour, their lack of empathy, coupled with inappropriately high social status require intervention.

**Objectives of the Macarthur Model**

The Macarthur Model is not a ‘prevention’ intervention. This model is a customised anti-bullying or anti-violence intervention devised to achieve specific, achievable, measurable objectives derived from research-based evidence in the particular setting.

If the Model is implemented in all schools across a state it will nevertheless be customised as the products and interventions initiated within the school will be defined by the data collected in the school, not by data collected in a range of unrelated schools. This is critical to the intervention as will be discussed further within the sections related to each component.

As a result of participating in this model all participants will:

- demonstrate personal and interpersonal behaviours which indicate an acceptable level of respect for the safety of others in the particular setting, including:
  - appropriate verbal interactions
  - appropriate physical interactions
  - acceptance of responsibility for protective intervention
- demonstrate a knowledge of the indicators and characteristics of bullying behaviours as differentiated from conflict, fighting and reciprocal disputes,
- construct and distribute a specific anti-bullying and anti-violence policy statement based on data collected at the setting
- implement organisational structures which provide support and protection for all members of the specific community including:
  - adequate supervision to discourage bullying or violence
  - adjustments to programs, timetables and routines which facilitate protection and supervision.
adequate resourcing for training personnel and community members, reporting and investigative procedures which lead to individual intervention

- develop, adopt and implement specific curricular materials and activities to provide education, knowledge and skills in relation to bullying and violence
- provide individual interventions for victims and perpetrators of bullying and violence to develop appropriate behavioural responses.

Application of the Model

The Macarthur Model has been developed over a number of years through in-servicing school staff and assisting with the implementation of the intervention in the particular setting. This has proven extremely effective as the data collected at the setting yield specific issues which require a customised approach. The Macarthur Model is applied in four stages:

Negotiation Stage: at which time the Model is explained to executive staff, a decision taken to continue the process and a commitment to follow the whole process is requested.

Assessment Stage: data are collected from the whole school population and analysed to reveal the specific problems and issues facing the setting.

Data yields statistical and descriptive information regarding the environment, school climate and student characteristics including the country of birth of themselves and their parents, gender and year level as well their bullied status.

Induction & Planning Stage: the whole school staff are given in-servicing regarding bullying generally to raise their awareness of the issue. The data is used as the basis for ten structured workshops dealing with identified problems and issues within the school (environmental factors, physical and verbal bullying, administrative structures which facilitate or ignore bullying etc). During these workshops decisions are taken about the policies, processes and procedures to be implemented to address the bullying problem.

Structured discussions take place which have as their goal the production of policy statements, an information booklet or other resource for distribution to all in the school community and the selection of strategies to address the issues raised.

Implementation Stage: involves the introduction of the changes determined by staff; community discussion, monitoring and evaluation of the impact, outcomes and processes.
Summary

The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive Intervention in Bullying in Schools is described briefly in this document. The key components of the Model provide a methodology for customising the intervention for each specific setting according to the needs identified. The process for implementation is long-term and requires the commitment of school communities to ensure efficacy and enduring results. The Model specifies for the first time a thorough approach to the issue of bullying and clearly identifies measurable goals towards a solution. It offers a timely intervention for the contemporary problem of bullying in schools.
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This submission is particularly concerned with pre service teacher education, the continuing professional development of teachers, school based strategies and responses to violence, and the development and implementation of anti-violence curricula in schools. The paper addresses the terms of reference as they apply to these key areas.

1. CHANGES IN THE NATURE, LEVEL AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS:

The perception in the media currently seems to be that gratuitous violence in schools is on the rise and that students and staff are more at risk today than ever before, of being physically or verbally assaulted while at school. The validity of this perception is being explored, but a case does not have to be proven before the need for a policy is accepted. Schools are expressing an interest in developing specific structures to reduce the possibility of increased violence and aggression. Both here and overseas systematic responses to anticipated violence are being developed in an effort to establish safe non-violent schools. (Nightingale and Mortimer 1992: Jenkin 1993).

The relevant statistical information regarding the incidence of violence in schools has been published (Schools Australia 1992) and on the surface seems to indicate increased involvement of students in violent incidents. The statistics, however, are inflated, due to the fact that all incidents on school grounds are included, not just those involving school students, nor those occurring only in school hours. In my view, the information is an inaccurate reflection of the true incidence of what could reasonably be termed "violence in schools". Some definition of the term, therefore needs to be stated. For the purpose of determining the severity of the problem of violence in schools the definition should confine itself to these parameters:

"Violence in schools refers to violent, assultive or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or school community members with each other, or with school property, and which occurs within normally accepted school hours and within normally accepted school boundaries and situations" (Jenkin 1993)

This definition specifically excludes acts of violence which occur outside these normally accepted bounds, situations and times, or which represent acts perpetrated against the school by persons outside the school community. In particular, it cannot be argued that community based gangs who enter school premises during or outside school hours to engage in acts of violence or vandalism should be represented in the statistics or definition of "school violence". This type of violence has its origins in the community and is a community responsibility - schools are merely the victims. Just as 'domestic violence' would not include intruders who entered a home to commit acts of violence, so this definition confines itself specifically to the interactions between school members, in the school environment during school hours.

It is my belief that if this definition were used, it could be readily shown that the level and incidence of violence in schools is remarkably low.

Schools need to delineate categorically the parameters of their responsibility. Media reports which refer to "schoolboy" crimes often fail to clarify whether in fact the crime occurred within school hours, schools grounds or during school based supervision. Indeed, the reference to "school" in many reports merely reflects the child's age (which will obviously be 'school-age') and it is somewhat mischievous of the media to continue to insinuate that all criminal or violent acts perpetrated by
children are in some way linked to "school". Therefore it would seem appropriate for schools to determine the extent of their supervisory responsibilities and to state these. For example, travel by public transport to and from school may not be viewed as requiring school supervision. 'Gang' conflicts outside school grounds; even between students of the school are probably beyond the jurisdiction of school authority, and certainly acts of violence or criminal behaviour engaged in after school hours, even if students are still in school uniform, are probably the responsibility of the community, not the school. Since a good deal of confusion seems to exist in this regard, it is important to record the agreed parameters for public scrutiny.

With regard to the 'nature' of violence in schools and the types of violence which occur, further research is warranted. Fighting, sexual harassment, gang membership and assaults, bullying and verbal aggression which occur within the prescribed limits stated here, need to be systematically examined and addressed. Some approaches to managing these violent behaviours are described further in this submission. However, two key aspects of school 'violence' which may warrant even closer examination are [1] teacher/student violence and [2] gender based violence.

1.1 Teacher/Student Violence

Abusive and emotionally or physically damaging behaviour should be equally rejected in adult personnel and students. This is a key consideration in a school milieu where relatively few constraints exist for monitoring teacher and student interpersonal interactions. Gelles (1973) suggests that violence against children is condoned as it is seen as the parent or teacher's duty and it is for the "child's own good", and the failure to eradicate corporal punishment supports this belief (Wallace 1986). Schools will not become safe places for students or teachers until society withdraws the right for adults to use physical punishment as part of a professional relationship.

It needs to be said, and it needs to be confirmed, that violent behaviour by any member of the school community will not be tolerated. Students know when philosophical statements refer to them but not to parents, teachers, ground staff or other adults at the school who may exhibit violent or aggressive behaviours. Incorporating this notion in the school culture can be somewhat purgative and difficult if individuals are not clear on this point but adults in the school community must be seen to model the appropriate behaviours (Smith & Barajas 1988). A categorical statement about which behaviours will be expected and which will not be accepted, should be made. Such behaviours as verbal abuse (name-calling, swearing, shouting and sarcasm) and physical abuse (pushing, striking, throwing objects etc) would be clearly identified and listed as inappropriate.

The school should also indicate that training and support will be available for those members of the school community whose behaviour indicates that their personal philosophy of violence differs substantially from the communal view and a statement in terms which identify measurable or specific behaviours to be demonstrated in the quest for a non violent school should be recorded.

It is an unpopular viewpoint to express, but I must nevertheless state that it is often the behaviour and attitudes of teachers and the impact these have on children, which I believe are at the root of much of the violence, aggression and abuse evident in schools.

Teachers have a good deal of power to make the lives of children at school a misery, and while I know that the majority of the teachers do not choose this course of action, I am equally sure that an unwarranted number do.
Teachers can physically restrain students, exclude them from the learning environment, deprive them of their recreation, the companionship of peers and the reinforcement of the classroom; teachers can deprive children of their liberty. Each of these punitive measures is permitted by government documentation and policy.

Teachers can also denigrate, embarrass, and verbally abuse children - although without formal permission to do so: and all of these behaviours and strategies are employed every day in our schools in an effort to 'control' students.

Any examination of the 'nature' of violence in schools cannot ignore these aspects of teacher and student relationships. This is not to discount or ignore the acts of violence which occur when students victimize their teachers. Such incidents are much better documented than those in which the reverse occurs. However, as an industrial issue, teachers who are the victims or survivors of such incidents, may well decide that legal action is warranted against the employing body for not providing adequate protection, or indeed against the institution which certified their adequacy to teach, without equipping them with appropriate management and response skills.

1.2 Gender-based Violence

This is an extremely influential area in the maintenance of violent cultures within schools. Such violence can take the form of verbal sexual harassment, denigration and slander, physical sexual exploitation and bullying. In the vast majority of cases, males are the perpetrators and females - either students or teachers - are the victims. Specific curriculum-based programmes (see 'Resolution 1' and "Resolve' Jenkin 1993 in appendix) which are gender differentiated, are necessary to teach appropriate attitudes, skills and information in an anti-violence mode. It is also possible that the image of the female teacher as subordinate to male executive, as vulnerable and dependent is maintained through school structures. Female teachers in particular need to be seen as effectively managing behaviour and demanding appropriate responses from students. The corporate culture of the school needs to reflect this.

2. FACTORS INFLUENCING VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS AND IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE.

In order to narrow the focus of this submission to the specific areas nominated, the key factors which will be addressed are:

2.1 Teacher Education and competencies
2.2 Behaviour Management Strategies

2.1 Teacher Education and Competencies

The Macro-system response to the problem of violence in schools, must incorporate the development of a national code of ethics for teachers. This notion would clearly delineate for the community the exact parameters of teacher professional responsibility. It should therefore clarify those areas of students' socialization and education which are fundamentally a community or family responsibility. Stated positively, the code of ethics would, as with any such document, provide reference points by which to measure professional
integrity. It would also act as a framework for protection of teachers just as similar codes offer other professions. The development of such a code of ethics for teachers is currently being explored (Jenkin 1993 see appendix) however, it seems fundamental that any profession ought to be able to identify competencies and state them as pre-requisites for employment. The code of ethics would state competencies, responsibilities, moral and legal obligations, professional standards for management of the environment, programmes and clientele, and a statement regarding accountability.

It is more than likely, in my view, that such a code could form the basis of a statement of pre-requisite skills for employment. Teachers and tertiary institutions responsible for their professional preparation, need to take due cognizance now of the absolute necessity to demand competency in the area of behaviour management and principles. This reciprocal regard for the foundation skills will ensure that pre service courses include specific documented content which equips teachers for their most demanding role - that of behaviour manager.

It should be recognised also that the super-imposition of a range of narrow and compartmentalized "skills" or approaches such as conflict resolution, crisis management or "behaviour modification" will not result in a comprehensively prepared professional. Teachers need, in their pre-service courses, to attain and demonstrate an understanding of the key principles of behaviour management. This includes an understanding of behaviour, and developmental aspects of behaviour as well as applied behaviour analysis and the ability to develop specific programmes for behaviour management. It is my view that such content would best be delivered as a full semester compulsory unit of study which should be a pre-requisite for graduation and employment (an outline of such a course of study I currently offer as an elective at this institution, is enclosed see Appendix Jenkin) or, a carefully sequenced delivery of smaller units throughout the course, with a net effect and contribution equivalent to such a unit.

Unless clients identify the specific skills and knowledge they believe are necessary, pre-service courses will continue to represent an amalgamation of the individual judgements of academics as to the most appropriate content. In relation to this also is the notion that superimposing a range of "special education" designated skills - such as individualizing instruction, diagnostic teaching etc., will necessarily 'prepare' new teachers for the role they assume in classrooms. Pre-service teacher education must also substantially address teacher attitudes and interpersonal skills if the professional skills are ever to be implemented. Teachers whose attitudes reflect apprehension about or rejection of students, will be less likely to be successful than teachers whose preservice experiences have included some exposure to difficult students (Jenkin 1991).

Providing for the identification of student academic, social and physical needs on an individual and group basis is fundamental. This needs to be thoroughly addressed as the evidence is overwhelming that students with learning, social, emotional and often physical impairments are the ones most likely to be victims or perpetrators of violence or aggression in schools. (Lane 1989; Olweus 1983; Prothrow-Stith 1987; Goldstein & Huff 1993; Long 1989; Askew 1989; Rose 1988). These students are more likely to be suspended for such incidents and to become recidivist and a significant number develop serious behavioural problems leading to incarceration. (Slee 1988; Bain 1988; Jenkin 1988). The students' academic social and behavioural skills need to be assessed and some individualization of programmes provided for. Teachers
obviously also need to be equipped with such strategies to be effective and competent in the classroom.

2.2 *Behaviour Management Strategies*

(i) The management style adopted by teachers often reflects a particular personality style or orientation. It is somewhat unfortunate that the "authoritarian" mode seems to be the preferred style of many and the expected approach by the community. It is quite likely that the emphasis by teachers and others on external "control" of young people is a key factor in the development of violent aggressive behaviours. The 'policeperson' approach gives a message to students that they are not responsible for their behaviour. It is up to the teacher to 'control' them. In my view, the only person the teacher can control is the self. Students need to be taught to accept responsibility for the behavioural choices they make and to accept the consequences. They cannot do this if there is no instruction or guidance in this regard. Instead of teachers seeing themselves as responsible for others' behaviour, they need to be trained to teach their charges to be aware of and responsible for their own behaviour. Teachers cannot do this if they themselves have been inadequately prepared.

(ii) Teachers have a range of strategies available to them, but unfortunately most of these are interpreted as punitive rather than remedial strategies. Such approaches as timeout, physical restraint, suspension and expulsion from school should all be delivered in a supportive and non-violent manner to be most effective. In particular, suspension support (see Jenkin Suspension Support Programme 1990 Appendix) can and should be used as a remedial strategy, not a means of punishing students.

It is the interaction of authoritarian teachers with naive and often equally authoritarian students which is at the root of much conflict in schools and which may well lead to violent interactions. In N.S.W. in 1987, schools were given the option of including the use of the 'cane' in their student welfare and discipline policy. The irony of including such an intrusive and violent form of punishment in a 'welfare' document obviously escaped the governmental authors of the policy. In any other situation, the use of a stick to beat a child would be interpreted as an act of violence and abuse, it is therefore ludicrous to suggest that such an activity can have any legitimate place in a profession devoted to teaching children. It stems in part from a lack of understanding of what constitutes "discipline". Discipline is actually a combination of reward and punishment (or consequences). Many members of the community and obviously governmental policy makers, are unclear of the purpose, rationale or effects of such an act. A broad based community education programme is therefore needed. Further, a policy which 'arms' teachers in this way, cannot be reconciled with other governmental policies which have determined that children can be expelled for being 'armed' (eg carrying a knife).

3. **POLICIES**

At the local level urgent attention ought to be paid to the development or structuring of a policy for a non-violent school. (Jenkin 1993). Extracts from the paper presented at the Institute for Criminology Conference on Violence (May 1993) clearly delineate the key areas for consideration, the basis of the
policy, philosophy and a range of preventative and responsive programmes for establishing and maintaining a non-violent culture within the school.

At the state level urgent attention needs to be paid to

3.1 the policies relating to corporal punishment, suspension, exclusion and expulsion. In my view it is ethically unacceptable and professionally unsound to use such strategies in a punitive way, when student skills and behaviour probably warrant remediation. Corporal punishment as an administrative or management option should be immediately withdrawn. Support for students prior to, during and following periods which indicate a need for a "time out" period or suspension must be provided through structured programmes and appropriate suspension. It is professionally negligent to suspend children from school without such provision (see Jenkin 1990 - Suspension Support Programme). This approach may prevent the development of resentment, hostility and the desire for retribution which may well lead to violent acts.

3.2 Department of School Education employment directives and policies.

To encourage tertiary training institutions to incorporate appropriate undergraduate components relating to behaviour management, the Department of School Education may need to consider making such components a prerequisite for employment. They would need to clearly identify the hours of contact considered minimal to meet this requirements (in my view, 13 weeks of 2 hours or a one-semester unit of study). Tertiary institutions engaged in teacher education can no longer abrogate responsibility for provision of such essential training, and the concept of basic teaching competencies, as suggested earlier may need to be explored by such institutions to placate the community. Teachers probably cannot be held accountable for their poor performances in this area, if no attention was paid to developing such skills throughout their pre-service preparation. Frequently, the teacher who supervises the student teacher during the practicum will provide the only systematic feedback and instruction they receive on behaviour management.

3.3 Welfare and Discipline Policy Review

This policy is compulsory for NSW schools and usually delineates the rewards, punishments and services available to maintain optimum support for students. A non-violent school will clarify some of the potentially conflicting response strategies available. If this school, for example states that corporal punishment (caning) of students is acceptable, some examination of the credibility of a policy for non-violence needs to be undertaken. We cannot demand that students remain unarmed if we approve 'arms' - however monitored - for teachers.

3.4 Further, with regard to pre-service preparation, it would behove tertiary institutions to ensure that those people engaged to deliver teacher education courses can document successful, recent and substantial teaching practice in schools as a pre-requisite for employment. A key reason for the paucity of teacher preparation in this area is the lack of skills, knowledge and experience of many tertiary educators engaged to deliver such programmes. At best, a teacher education course represents simply the amalgamation of the individual judgements of academics as to the most appropriate content,
with little consultation between units of study convenors as to the
essential underpinnings. Whilst such professional judgements and
freedoms need to be maintained, some parameters should be
established which relate to basic professional competencies for
beginning teachers.

4. PROGRAMMES, INTERVENTION STRATEGIES AND EXEMPLARY
PRACTICE

The fundamental aim of programmes, strategies and practices employed in the
management of so called 'school violence' must be to attain a consistent result
- students who behave appropriately, achieve and make progress and who
cope emotionally with school demands. Whilst some of their success in these
areas certainly depends upon their own psychological and cognitive
integration, the impact of professionals cannot be denied selection of
programmes, strategies and practices, therefore needs to take into
consideration this ultimate aim. Whilst there may always be students whose
behaviour deviates so far from the norm as to warrant specialist intervention,
the majority of students should be maintained in the mainstream of education
with substantial support access. Teachers have numerous options at present
to exclude students from the classroom and school, but appropriate teacher
preparation in terms of attitudes and skills may encourage a more inclusive
response.

Having determined that a range of approaches is necessary because of
individual needs and orientations of teachers, students and others, the
programmes section should identify major programme types:

4.1 Curricular programmes
4.2 Preventative programmes and strategies,
4.3 Responsive programmes and strategies
4.4 Administrative considerations

4.1 Curricular Programmes

Obviously curriculum guidelines for delivery of content, basic
competencies and skills in the key learning areas should be followed.
However, if violence and aggression are evident as problems in the
school environment, teachers may need to reconsider the emphasis of
their curriculum planning. In such a setting, a shift towards
behavioural and social skills programmes as the school major
components of their teaching may need to be considered. If students
have difficulty relating to each other and to staff then it seems unlikely
they will satisfactorily complete academic assignments anyway. A key
to the success of programmes in support units for emotionally and
behaviourally disturbed children in Western Sydney, was recognition
of this fact. (Jenkin 1989). Academic programmes were systemized
and individualized comprehensively so that work was always
presented at either the independent or instructional level. This left
teachers free to incorporate social skills and behaviour skills
programmes into every activity and interaction entered into during
academic learning time. In addition, specific lessons which related to
social skills development and behaviour skills for interpersonal
interactions were presented daily. School personnel need to re-think
and to state in the policy for a non-violent school, that the immediate
emphasis for their teaching of particular students may not always be
academic content and skills, and the necessity for this should be
endorsed by the administration or executive. Teachers who need to
manage difficult students' behaviour, should not be made to feel guilty because academic activities are given a reduced priority in some circumstances. This philosophy, supports teachers' attempts to teach the whole child, but at the same time, has, as a foundation, acceptance of the notion that all three aspects of the child's needs are the responsibility of educators. Teachers need not necessarily deliver all three programme components alone - collaboration with support teachers and counsellors may be sought.

Curricular programmes should be listed in the school document related to anti-violence policy:

Academic. The policy should state that academic programmes will be based on department of school education guidelines but will reflect individual student needs and competencies, will be criterion referenced, systematically recorded and evaluated. Individualization of classroom programmes is a key skill for teachers to acquire.

Social skills. A structured social skills programme such as the Hill Walker Series (e.g. ACCEPTS) as well as incidental, though monitored social skills management should be identified.

Behaviour. Specific behaviour programmes such as Aggression Response Training (Goldstein) Violence Prevention (Prothrow-Stith), Talk Sense to Yourself (Wragg) as well as strategies devised by staff to manage aggressive behaviour in a positive, firm and effective manner should be recorded.

4.2 Preventative Programmes

If the schools are to comprehensively deal with all aspects of violence prevention, this needs to identify personal, interpersonal, professional and administrative strategies for management. Goldstein & Glick (1988) identified 157 various approaches to violence prevention in U.S. schools, ranging from arming teachers to parental patrols and Federal legislation. While this range of preventative measures is not required or desired by Australian schools, a more creative and effective range does need to be compiled.

Students need to be prepared and supported in developing individual strategies for preventing their victimization at school. The two major groups identified as likely to be involved in incidents seem to be a physically weak and emotionally insecure group of children who are generally on the receiving end of the violence perpetrated, and a socially/emotionally deprived or neglected group of children who perpetrate the violence against other children to bolster their self-esteem (Olweus (1987); Lane (1989); Askew (1989)).

(i) Children and Youth

Children need to establish and maintain personal strengths as a means of dealing with aggression directed towards them, or selecting more appropriate behaviour when the temptation to use violence arises. This is obviously a long term goal. Goldstein (1989) and Lane (1989) describe the personality characteristics of individual students as 'fitting' them for one role or the other. There seems to be a reciprocal need satisfaction established as violent/aggressive children get what they want and the recipients gain peace temporarily by surrendering. The
vast literature presently accumulating on school bullying supports this. Programmes which address these populations need to be identified, examined and those deemed most appropriate, recorded in the school policy. All children, for example, should be given the opportunity to develop appropriate social communication skills, play skills and multiple dimensions of self esteem. The SDQI (Self Description Questionnaire devised by Marsh (1989) is an accurate and relevant tool for identifying self selected low-esteem areas, which teachers can then target. In addition, moral development, empathy training, anger control, conflict resolution and cognitive restructuring approaches abound and can be selectively included to ensure that the skills students are required to demonstrate are actually within their behavioural repertoire.

(ii) Teachers and Other Staff

One of the key issues in management of aggression and violence by professions is, increasingly, the preferred style, personality type, teaching and learning methodologies selected. Systematic and credible measurements of variations in these should be utilized to help adults in the potentially violent situation create a descriptive portfolio of their own characteristics. Such introspection can prove cathartic, but if considered realistically can contribute to a new understanding of others whose styles differ substantially from one's own. In addition, it is essential that teachers engage in relevant in-service activities which will provide background information, strategies and practice in order to prepare teachers and others with knowledge of the sources, causes and dynamics of aggression. (Bowie, 1989). By increasing their knowledge base, the options for effective intervention also increase. The Coping with Violence workshops (Jenkin & Bowie 1992) (see Appendix) address these issues and present strategies for interpersonal, physical and organizational intervention for violent behaviours.

In addition, stress management, communication and classroom management strategies need to be explored. The school should be able to guarantee that each staff member has documented knowledge and understanding of the basic principles of behaviour.

(iii) Parents

Schools are generally reluctant to commission parent-education activities which may involve staff in long hours of additional attendance. The importance of home-school liaison in establishing and maintaining appropriate behaviours, has been discussed by Christenson (1992), Ward & Gow (1982) and others and the generalization of behaviours successfully developed in school settings, to the less structured home setting is a problem which needs further exploration. Programmes presented at the school for in-service training for teachers could no doubt be made available to interested parents and community members, but specific programmes which establish a closely monitored link between home and school behavioural performance may need to be devised for the particular setting and child.

The Suspension Support Programme (Jenkin 1990) (Jenkin 1992) (see Appendix) comprises three modules - the Pre-Suspension, In-School Suspension and Suspension Support module, the focus being children whose behaviours deviate sufficiently from that of others in the school to warrant suspension. The strategy involves close home-school
liaison and parent participation and may be included in the "preventative" category if implemented to ensure the child remains mainstream. It should be noted that the professional and personal skills of parents should be accessed wherever possible, as a rich resource of information, and skill can remain untapped if the school does not appear to have an "open door" policy.

4.3 Responsive Programmes

The school need to identify programmes to be mobilized in the event of an incident or series of incidents within the school.

(i) Physical Responses

The school can decide that in the event of a violent incident, specified forms of physical restraint, can be implemented. To ensure a strategy is within the philosophical and practical constraints of a policy for non-violence, however, approve training for staff should be conducted. Such programmes as 'P.A.R.T.' developed by Dr. Paul Smith (1988) and "Evasive Self-Defence" devised by Vaughan Bowie (1989) are appropriate for this purpose. Department of School Education policy on the use of physical restraint will need to be incorporated into the policy or rejected as inappropriate by the school community. Many teachers are not comfortable with the concept of restraining violent students and alternative approaches should be sought in this case.

(ii) Timeout

The specific implementation procedures for use of timeout as consequence should be clarified for inclusion in the policy for non-violent school. Locked rooms, indefinite periods of time for isolation, physical force and verbal abuse are inconsistent with a policy for non-violence. The school may need to examine the specifics of this strategy as identified in their welfare and discipline policy, in order to ensure an interface with the new policy.

(iii) Corporal Punishment

This strategy is included in some school welfare and discipline policies after minimal consultation with parents, but ramifications for violence within the school if such a strategy is consistently implemented are significant. It must be genuine felt that the policy for non-violence applies to all members the school community, and this particular strategy cannot be reconciled with such a policy.

(iv) Suspension, Expulsion, Exclusion

Schools generally feel the need to have access to procedures which relieve staff and other students temporarily from disruptive students. However, these periods of agreed absence from school are usually not supervised, repress potentially reinforcing situations and often expose students to situations they have already indicted they cannot deal with. Specific recent incidents in NSW illustrate that such a strate
can also offer the opportunity for students to contemplate revenge and act on such an idea. A policy for a non-violent school should probably identify a series of procedures which offer support to ensure that the 'timeout' from school period is effectively used to develop improved skills and attitudes. (Jenkin 1990).

(v) Grievance procedure

Just as any large organization has an agreed grievance procedure to empower members in discussing practices and behaviours which disturb, offend or threaten them, this policy should clarify the methodology and personnel available for registering a complaint concerning violence. It may be appropriate to create a joint staff/student committee to facilitate and moderate between school community members. However, access to external personnel should be an option if the parties cannot resolve the grievance and the policy needs to identify appropriate and acceptable individuals. Further it is essential that all members of the school/community have equal access to the procedure. This is not to assume that having such access will necessarily empower members to use the process to protect their rights, but the school community needs to offer this commitment in the policy statement and make every attempt to encourage participation. Obviously, students, particularly in the primary years will need to be given skills and information to assist them to access such a procedure.

(vi) Crises Management Strategy

A number of schools in NSW are currently implementing in-service programmes to equip staff with the necessary attitudes and skills to respond effectively in the event of major or minor crises within the school. While this general strategy will not just be mobilized for violent incidents the underlying principles represent a valuable contribution to the skills of teachers and students. For this reason its inclusion in the policy is recommended.

(vii) Structured debriefing (Jenkin 1991) (See Appendix)

In order to ensure that violent incidents are thoroughly analysed and to avoid the depression they can often cause (Bowie 1988) a supportive structure needs to be put in place to facilitate the immediate debriefing of those involved. This particular strategy describes an approach involving colleagues in a structured procedure. However, an informal daily debriefing session should be incorporated into the timetable particularly in specific settings where behavioural confrontations can be anticipated. This will obviously require administrative support and possibly some re-organization of duties and responsibilities, perhaps on a rostered basis, but should nevertheless be identified in the policy statement.

4.4 Administrative Considerations

The policy needs to clarify the commitment of the administration elements of the school to the maintenance of a policy for non violence.
This will involve commitment in the area of funding and organization specifically.

(i) **Funding or budget commitments** should reflect that monies needed to support programmes which effectively reduce violence, or which feasibly could do so, will be pledged annually and provided consistently. Further, the availability from outside sources of funds should be researched and strategies for their acquisition put into place. A committee for the development of substantial submission for such funding could be initiated through the policy statement.

(ii) **Organizational flexibility** is a key to successful management of violent or aggressive behaviour. The flexibility to select or change locations to suit specific management purposes is important for teachers who are developing strategies. This includes provision for timetabling, environmental and staff changes to be incorporated at short notice in response to incidents and in the longer term for flexibility of these elements as they relate to violence management.

(iii) **Organizational decisions**

The roles and responsibilities of staff in relation to the policy should be defined to facilitate the process of implementation. In order to ensure that the policy does not become ‘shelved’, a regular staff discussion of the document as it develops following construction, should be arranged. A regular segment at staff meetings, regular committee conventions and organization of input into documentation, would contribute to a dynamic policy.

(iv) **Strategy selection** - having determined that a range of strategies is available, access to these needs to be described, decisions made as to the preferred strategy for teachers own purposes and documentation of choice needs to be recorded. Concern that a single strategy should be used throughout the school should be replaced on the understanding that the outcomes for all strategies used should be consistent i.e. children who are safe, non-violent, happy and making progress within individual classrooms. This should be stated in the policy.

(v) **Service delivery modes** - the policy statement needs to support the notion of differentiation in delivery taking into account educational and administrative requirements as well as the individual preferences of teachers and staff. Some variations in delivery needs to be incorporated into programmes to ensure that students receive stimulation and achieve progress. Matching student preferred modes and teacher preferred modes in learning and teaching can only improve delivery and outcomes. Further, the availability of counselling, therapies and other support services needs to be identified in the policy. The right of the students to receive an effective training/education programme needs to be balanced with the right of the teacher to perform to maximum ability without impediment. Consideration of the needs of both parties should be clearly stated in the policy.

Inevitably, unless management encourages and supports the staff/student/community initiatives for violence prevention by adjusting traditional administrative arrangements, the logistics of implementation will lead to failure for the programmes. A degree of flexibility will need to be introduced in relation to class sizes and
composition, timetables, staff distribution and duties, resources allocation etc. For example, an In-school Suspension programme, to be introduced effectively may require access to a room and furnishings, staff to operate the programme on a rotational basis, supervision to be increase etc.

Finally, included in the appendix are outlines for specific curricula related to an anti-violence approach. These have been developed over the past 12 months and will be trialled in schools during 1994. The comprehensive approach to coping with violence in schools described in the appendix has been well-received by schools and Department of School Education executive personnel as the programme is specifically related to pragmatic approaches, readily adapted by teachers. It is to be hoped that such programmes are given financial and philosophical support by government to ensure that students in schools are prepared for life and induction into society as individuals committed to non-violence.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In relation to the nature, level and incidence of violence in schools.

**Recommendation 1** that the Department of School Education develop specific
guidelines for the recording of incidents at schools which fall within the
definition proposed (pg 3 of this submission)

**Recommendation 2** that such records indicate exact behaviours and types of
violence so that an accurate assessment of the nature, level and rate of violent
incidents can be recorded

**Recommendation 3** that incidents in which students are treated aggressively,
violeantly or in an abusive manner by teachers should be recorded as well as
those incidents in which teachers are victimized by students and students
victimize each other

**Recommendation 4** that the records and statistical information thus gathered be
used for positive public information statements which will deliver a truthful
impression to the community

**Recommendation 5** that incidents which result from intruders entering the school
be properly reported as attacks upon the school rather than as incidents of
'school violence'

**Recommendation 6** that incidents which occur outside the specific definition
proposed, be reported to the media as community-based acts of violence and
specifically rejected as having a relationship to schools

**Recommendation 7** that schools identify teachers who respond in aggressive or
violent or abusive ways towards other members of the school community and
offer advice, training and counselling

**Recommendation 8** that schools identify students who respond in aggressive or
violent or abusive ways towards other members of the school community and
offer advice, training and counselling

**Recommendation 9** that all forms of aggression and violence be identified and
recorded as unacceptable by the school community members; including:
sexual harrassment, bullying, racism, denominational harrassment, gender-
based abuse, disability-based abuse, ability-based abuse, appearance-based
abuse, verbal abuse (sarcasm, name calling, swearing, denigration) and
physical aggression

**Recommendation 10** that the school community balance rewards and punishments in
the delivery of discipline procedures

**Recommendation 11** that schools demand to be staffed by professionals with
documented expertise, tertiary studies and experience in managing
behaviour

**Recommendation 12** that schools develop individual policies that state their
commitment to non-violent culture

**Recommendation 13** that schools implement programmes which encourage non-
violecent interactions by skilling students, teachers and the school
community in alternative responses
Recommendation 14 that schools demand of the general community an acceptance of responsibility for the supervision and management of school age persons outside school hours

Recommendation 15 that schools delineate specific parameters for the responsibility and notify the community of these

Recommendation 16 that teachers at all levels be required to attain and maintain specific skills in behaviour management

Recommendation 17 that the exact parameters of teacher responsibility for supervision be publically stated including any extension to out of school hours

Recommendation 18 that particularly within school hours, grounds and situations, teachers be given specific supervisory duties to maintain order and protection of students

Recommendation 19 that advisory grievance, management and policy committees within schools have student and parent representation and input

Recommendation 20 that students be viewed as clients deserving the highest possible standards of professional service.
STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL ISSUES
Parliament of New South Wales, Legislative Council

SUMMONS BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL ISSUES

UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY EVIDENCE ACT 1901, NO. 43

TO: MS JEAN JENKIN
Special Education Lecturer
University of Western Sydney.

I inform you that the Standing Committee on Social Issues, appointed by the Legislative Council of New South Wales, which is considering and reporting on Youth Violence in New South Wales has ordered that you shall attend before it to give evidence upon the subject matter of its Inquiry.

I give notice that you are required to attend before the Standing Committee on Monday, the 11th day of October 1993 at 4.00 p.m. in Parliament House, Macquarie Street, Sydney to give evidence as to and concerning the matters to be inquired into by the Committee.

In default of your attending you may be proceeded against under the provisions of the Parliamentary Evidence Act, 1901.

Signed at Sydney, this Friday the eighth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and ninety three.

Hon. Dr. Marlene Goldsmith, MLC
Committee Chairman
A REPORT INTO YOUTH VIOLENCE IN NEW SOUTH WALES
Ms Margaret Condonis
Manager, Adolescent Family Therapy and Mediation Service (RAPS)

Ms Marie Coussens
Policy Officer, Department of Juvenile Justice

Mr Phil Cross
President, NSW Teachers' Federation

Mr William Cureton
Secretary/Treasurer, Southern Metropolitan Region, Registered Clubs Association of NSW

Mr Mark D'Astoli
Youth Advisory Council

Mr David Denborough
Man Against Sexual Assault (MASA)

Mr Mark Dennis
Solicitor, Western Aboriginal Legal Service

Mr James Dibble, AM, MBE
Chairman, The Peer Support Foundation Limited

Ms Marg Edwards
Co-convenor, Gay and Lesbian Teachers and Students Association

Ms Claire Edwards
Youth Advisory Council

Senior Sergeant Ian Fitzsimmons
Station Controller, Dubbo Police Patrol, NSW Police Service

Ms Leonie Funk
Social Worker, Come-in Youth Resource Centre

Ms Mary Ghaleb
Youth Advisory Council

Ms Margaret Gleeson
Co-ordinator, Community Youth Support Taskforce, Walgett

Ms Unis Goh
Acting Manager, Care & Protection Directorate, Department of Community Services

Ms Jenny Grant
Senior Parenting Consultant, Tolland Parents as Teachers Program

Mr David Green
Youth Co-ordinator, Community Youth Taskforce, Moree

Ms Lenore Grunsell
Secretary (and School Counsellor), School Psychologists Australia (Inc)

Mr Ray Handley
Head Teacher, South Coast Wilderness Enhanced Program, NSW Department of School Education

Ms Chastity Harris
Come-In Youth Resource Centre

Ms Judy Hatswell
Training and Development Officer, Australian Guidance and Counselling Association

Ms Suzi Hewlett
Executive Officer, Youth Action and Policy Association (NSW) Inc

Ms Cathy Hickey
Independent Teachers Association

Sergeant Phillip Hickman
Former Team Leader, Transit Crime Unit, Tactical Intelligence Group, NSW Police Service

Ms Leora Hirsch
Co-ordinator of Street Work Program, Barnardo's

Detective Tony Holmes
Broken Hill Patrol, NSW Police Service

Mr Ron Hurley
President, NSW Secondary Principals' Association

Mr John Jablonka
Street Worker, Wentworthville Youth Centre

Mr Ian Jackson
Education Officer, Parramatta Catholic Education Office

Mr Peter James
NSW Secondary Principals' Association

Ms Tanya Jeffcoat
Young Women's Electoral Lobby

Ms Jean Jenkin
Lecturer (Special Education), University of Western Sydney, Macarthur
Rangers. Some evidence to the Committee suggested that simulated and real violence are merging in the playground:

_When Ninja Turtles were very popular, many primary schools had to ban any reference or activity that related to Ninja Turtles simply because of the amount of damage being done to fellow students in the playground_ (Cross Evidence, 11.10.93).

**Evidence Against a Link**

In relation to children imitating television characters, other evidence suggested children who act out this media violence represent a small minority. One psychiatrist suggested to the Committee that it is children with psychotic tendencies, rather than conduct-disorders, that may form an identity with movie characters such as the Terminator or Rambo (Wever Evidence, 26.04.94). Another psychiatrist suggested that:

_Most nine year old children can very confidently tell you, "it is just a story"_ (Kowalenko Evidence, 26.07.94).

The Committee was informed that modelling play on media influences may be a normal part of child development:

_If we have children who are coming to school and pretending to be Ninja Turtles, that is probably quite a healthy activity for them to be playing and acting out .... that only becomes a problem when the children fail to differentiate between simulated violence and it merges into real violence_ (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

It is important to define and distinguish different kinds of violence and types of effects. It was suggested at the World Summit on Television and Children that the question that must be asked is whether media violence is contributing to a greater sum of violent behaviour. While it is clear that media violence influences the form of play children undertake, this does not mean they are more violent than they would otherwise be (Buckingham, 1995).

Other evidence suggests there is no relationship between the viewing habits of violent offenders and their behaviour. The Young Offenders and the Media survey commissioned by the British Board of Film Classification, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Broadcasting Standards Council and the Independent Television Commission polled 80 young recidivist offenders and 500 school children. The survey found that the young offenders did not watch more violent films or television programs than other children, and preferred soap operas (Moir, 1994). However, the Committee notes there is violent content in soap operas.

An Argentinian researcher suggested at the World Summit on Television and Children that a person's relationship with television will depend on society, culture and family roles and ties, resulting in two levels of influence of TV. The first is a general level of influence, from which young people derive their language, fashion, and social issues for communicative purposes.
These consultations have included regular meetings of Directors-General. Dr Boston referred specifically to his attempts at addressing elements of the Carrick report dealing with early childhood which are yet to be implemented. The Department of School Education sponsored a state-wide conference on early childhood education and services. Pilot parenting programs are also being developed by the Department of Community Services, with the Department of School Education providing accommodation in schools, and the Department of Health providing health care services (Boston Evidence, 29.07.94). The Committee supports this continuing commitment to parenting programs, both within the Department and in conjunction with other government agencies.

It was suggested to the Committee that there is room for improvements in information resources regarding the availability of services for students and their families:

*When schools turn to outside agencies for support it's (a) very hard to identify what the agencies are and (b) there does not seem to be a great deal of coordination* (Cross Evidence, 11.10.93).

This claim was supported by another witness who suggested that school counsellors are not briefed on the policies of other agencies, there are no interdepartmental policies specifying how liaison between agencies takes place, and a working party to develop interagency policies on student violence has yet to be set up. As a result, and

*Due to an apparent lack of interagency liaison some policies in other areas appear to conflict or to leave students in need of support* (In camera Evidence).

The Committee believes interagency policies and protocols should be developed, and resource material produced outlining the roles and responsibilities of agencies that contribute to confronting youth violence.

The Committee considers there to be scope for schools to develop links with educational specialists from outside the school environment to assist in offering programs in schools. With an overcrowded curriculum and increasing teacher stress:

*Schools can look at involving universities and people outside the school .... schools could perhaps be a little more creative in the way in which they access expertise outside the school, and bring people in to teach the children* (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

**RECOMMENDATION 61**

That the Minister for Education continue and extend the Department of School Education's involvement in parenting programs, both within the Department and in conjunction with other government departments.
many of our societal structures actually leave parents on the periphery of it all - they end up with the pieces rather than being invited to come and participate in dealing with behavioural problems (Ludbrook Evidence, 01.11.93).

The Committee also heard that any intervention into violent behaviour needs to include the whole family and the community from which that child comes:

Parents need to help to raise a child’s self-esteem and to co-operate with the aims of those running the program (Black Evidence, 26.04.94).

It was suggested that parents can be involved in some of the remedial strategies that schools can implement, such as pre-suspension activities, and programs such as Talk Sense to Yourself and Stop, Think, Do (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

The Director of the National Children’s and Youth Law Centre informed the Committee that under the New Zealand Education Act there is a statutory obligation on principals to provide good guidance and counselling to every student in the school, and if there are matters that are hindering a student’s progress within the school, the principal is obliged to involve parents:

If you look at education law in Australia, I am quite surprised at how little positive emphasis there is on students’ rights and parents’ rights (Ludbrook Evidence, 01.11.93).

The Committee heard that considerable power in schools in New Zealand rests with school boards, and that

parents, if they are voting as a block, probably have more power than the other groups as a whole (Ludbrook Evidence, 01.11.93).

In addition, School Charters enshrine principles such as appropriate gender and racial representation on the school board (Ludbrook Evidence, 01.11.93).

In New South Wales, School Councils offer opportunities for parents and the community to be involved in supporting the education of young people.

In releasing guidelines for the establishment of School Councils, the then Director-General of the Department of School Education suggested that this process would provide a mechanism to address two key elements of school effectiveness:

- a strong principal who sets clear goals, emphasises the quality of teaching and learning and who manages the school wisely; and
- a commitment and deep involvement of the local community, particularly parents, in the life of a school (NSW Department of School Education, 1990a:i).

The guidelines state that membership of the School Council should include the school principal, the President of the Parents’ and Citizens’ Association, elected members from the school staff, elected members from the parents, and appointed members from the local community. A
8.1.4 Responding to Critical Incidents

When an incident of a serious nature occurs in a school, support services are needed to assist students and staff to deal with their grief and trauma. Such procedures are in place within the Department. The Committee heard, for example, that after a shooting by a student in the Northern region of the state, the Department of School Education ensured that counsellors and other officers were brought in as quickly as possible. Additional counselling resources from outside agencies were also accessed.

The decision to provide external resources to schools can be made by Assistant-Directors General upon receipt of a serious Critical Incident Report. In 1993, Guidelines for the Management of Critical Incidents in Schools were distributed to schools, recommending the establishment of a Critical Incident Committee and response planning.

The President of the NSW Teachers’ Federation stated in evidence before the Committee that:

*I think the handling of critical incidents policies and practices that have now been put into effect are in general fairly good .... it’s a lot harder when you get to the less spectacular incidents, because the school at the time has to deal with it with its staff* (Cross Evidence, 11.10.93).

The Committee heard that counselling sessions or debriefing for students involved in violent acts, either directly or indirectly, are provided in Catholic schools. Psychologists from Catholic Education Offices are also available to assist schools in initiating Critical Incident Plans (Jackson Evidence 08.11.93).

8.1.5 Policy for a Non-violent School

In a submission to the Committee, Jean Jenkin, Lecturer in Special Education at the University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, outlined the requirements of a policy for a non-violent school.

Designing a policy for a non-violent school requires corporate commitment. The policy should:

- refer to the school being a safe and non-violent place;
- recognise the legal, moral and psychological rights of members of the school community; and
- delineate the responsibilities of members of the school community.

Since a policy of non-violence covers the whole school community, corporal punishment has no place.
The recruitment of teaching staff with views which accord with the school's philosophy needs to be considered, as do appropriate induction and orientation programs, with the development of support teams.

The academic, social and physical needs of students must be provided for, which may involve individualisation of programs, and inclusion and representation in policy development. The role and responsibilities of parents should be clarified, with representation in training and support programs, and individual consultation as required.

The policy should contain a program section, including curricular programs (academic, social and behavioural); preventative programs (for children, teachers and parents); responsive programs (welfare and discipline policy, physical responses, timeout, suspension/expulsion, grievance procedures, crisis management strategies, and structured debriefings); and administrative considerations (funding or budget commitments and organisational flexibility).

Processes for implementation, including roles in organisational decisions, in strategy selection and in service delivery, evaluation, and documentation need to be arrived at. Available human, material and administrative resources should also be listed (Submission 3).

The Committee has heard that a number of schools, both primary and secondary schools, have developed policies for non-violence in consultation with students. These policies may be simple statements of the rights and responsibilities of students. The Committee believes such policies would be a valuable contribution to the development of a school culture promoting non-violence. Rather than a prescriptive approach, the Committee believes that the Department of School Education should provide a resource for schools outlining best practice to encourage and assist them in the development and introduction of a policy for a non-violent school.

RECOMMENDATION 68

That the Minister for Education require the Department of School Education to review, on a regional basis, existing policies for non-violent schools and produce a resource for schools that outlines standards of best practice and encourages student involvement in developing such a policy, including an outline of their rights and responsibilities.

The Independent Teachers Association's Draft Policy

The Independent Teachers Association has developed a draft policy on violence in schools which was endorsed by the annual conference in 1993. The union entered into the drafting of the policy because of the extent of concerns raised by members of the union, particularly over the last few years, regarding the impact of violence in schools. The Committee was informed that implementation of the final recommendations would be negotiated at diocesan and school level (Hickey Evidence, 26.04.94).
8.2.3 Teacher Training

Several witnesses suggested to the Committee that current teacher training courses are inadequate in terms of classroom management strategies:

*One of the gaps in pre-service education is certainly in the area of behaviour management - we don't have a course of study that runs for one semester called behaviour management in the classroom which I think is absolutely essential* (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

Concern was also expressed that university staff presenting existing components covering behaviour management may not have experience of classroom management.

The submission from the National Children’s and Youth Law Centre suggests that teachers be trained or re-trained in fair discipline methods which focus on constructive, non-violent methods (Submission 26).

The Head Teacher of the South Coast Wilderness Enhanced Program, within NSW Department of School Education, contends that a number of benefits could arise from improved professional training of teachers. These include improved modelling of non-violent behaviours; a creative and clever, rather than defensive and violent, response to problems; a decrease in teacher stress and improved morale; improved community perceptions of school and teachers; and community values reflecting the changes in attitudes of teachers and students (Submission 28).

The Committee believes that behaviour management training should be an integral part of pre-service teacher training, and that this issue should be addressed in consultation with University Vice-Chancellors.

Several witnesses suggested training was particularly relevant given the aging of the teacher population (Cross Evidence, 11.10.93; Hurley Evidence 22.02.94).

However, other witnesses suggested that providing incentives for the recruitment of more mature aged persons into the teaching profession would yield rewards due to their greater life experience (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

The Committee supports initiatives that would widen teacher recruitment, if such initiatives are supported by appropriate in-service training.

The Committee recognises that in certain areas of the state, the teacher population is aging and these staff would benefit from some targeted training programs. In other areas of the state, particularly in the urban developing areas, training programs for younger teachers to support them in situations involving student violence and aggression would be advantageous.

**RECOMMENDATION 73**

*That the Minister for Education bring the issue of adequate pre-service teacher training in strategies to deal with violence, including behaviour management, to the attention of University Vice-Chancellors.*
RECOMMENDATION 74

That the Minister for Education examine the feasibility of recruiting mature age persons with appropriate skills into the teaching profession.

8.2.4 Teacher-student Relations

A number of witnesses suggested to the Committee that inappropriate interactions between students and teachers can exacerbate classroom tension and lead to violent incidents:

assaultive and abusive behaviour [is] a cause of concern from the perspective of the students .... [and is a] result of a lack of strategies on the part of the teachers and obviously the stress the teachers are under (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

The Committee heard that teachers should ensure that they model appropriate self-control at all times (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93). Another witness suggested that

teachers are not necessarily just teachers, they must be managers; they must be managers of students’ behaviour and must actually work with their students and become close to them as people as well as teach content (Hatswell Evidence, 22.02.94).

Obviously, student behaviour can have a considerable effect on teaching staff. The Committee heard that a growing number of teachers were finding it difficult to return to school after they had experienced assaults or verbal threats (Cross Evidence, 11.10.93). The recent introduction of an Employee Assistance Program, offering a 24 hour counselling service from contracted psychologists, may assist in addressing this problem.

8.3 THE STUDENT

8.3.1 Student Participation

Several witnesses suggested to the Committee that there is a relationship between boredom and alienation and behavioural problems:

I think a lot of disciplinary problems at schools are because kids are bored and because they feel that whatever they do they are targeted for failure (Ludbrook Evidence, 01.11.93).

This experience of alienation can be exacerbated by the decision-making culture of schools:

The less involved students are in making decisions, the more frustrated they become, and the more alienated they are from their destiny (Brown Evidence, 25.10.93).
as alternative educational programs must be considered (Department of School Education, 1994a:3-4).

The guidelines view suspension as providing a "period when all parties can seek a positive resolution to the problem" (Department of School Education, 1994a:1).

Concern was expressed to the Committee that school counsellors are not always involved in short suspensions, as discipline and welfare strategies are sometimes seen by principals as being independent (Pickering Evidence, 08.11.93). The Committee believes the welfare and behavioural needs of suspended students must be met, and that this matter should be addressed.

**RECOMMENDATION 78**

That the Minister for Education amend the suspension, exclusion and expulsion procedures to

- include definitions of the type of violent behaviour that should lead to suspension, while maintaining the discretionary power of principals; and

- ensure that the welfare and behavioural needs of such students are met through means such as informing school counsellors of all short suspensions and involving them in discussions on appropriate actions to be taken.

- **Suspension and Pre-suspension Programs**

On the issue of suspensions, a number of witnesses raised the importance of ensuring that students who have been suspended, or are at-risk of suspension, receive appropriate assistance:

*There is no point in suspending a child and allowing them to come back twenty days later if there has been no intervention: there is nothing that has changed in the school, there is nothing that has changed in that child's life and there is nothing that has changed in the teacher's life .... For any real success, we need to look at pre-suspension and post-suspension programs* (Hatswell Evidence, 22.02.94).

It was suggested to the Committee that students' behaviour can deteriorate while they are under suspension, and that for those students the school's approach may need to shift from an academic emphasis to an intensive input on social skills and behaviour (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93). Ms Jenkin, a lecturer in Special Education at the University of Western Sydney, has co-ordinated the Macarthur suspension support program which offers suspended students an academic and social skills program.
In evidence to the Committee, Ms Jenkin advocated the development of in-school suspension programs to include a separate academic program while also addressing the problem behaviour. Schools should

*try to be a little more creative in the deployment of the resources that they already have and perhaps adjust the duties and responsibilities of teachers so that they can ... be available to run an in-school suspension program* (Jenkin Evidence, 11.10.93).

During the course of its inquiry, the Committee visited a number of schools and alternative education facilities offering pre-suspension programs including The Cottage, on the grounds of Regents Park Public School in the Metropolitan South West region. The "Cottage program" targets students in the junior years of high school who are displaying behaviour which is unacceptable and threatening to the student's continued enrolment at school. A "tutorial program" is also available for those not enrolled at school, and who may be chronic school refusers.

The Cottage program aims to ensure that students can resolve conflict situations and are provided with an extensive array of behavioural options so that they can succeed at school and at home. The students attending the program usually come from dysfunctional or violent family backgrounds providing poor role models for behaviour, and with discipline irregularly and inappropriately administered. They often experience difficulties in the transition from primary school to secondary school, and have poor self-image. The Committee was advised that self-esteem is increased by the students' experiences within the program.

The Cottage offers the program for one day each week for 12 or 24 weeks while the child attends their regular school for the remainder of the week. Students are referred through their year adviser or school counsellor to the District Guidance Officer, and then to the Cottage counsellor. The program includes personal projects; stress management; homework/schoolwork review; art and expression; drama and lifeskills. Students are encouraged to set behavioural goals for the home, their schools, and for themselves through a contract system, and the achievement of these goals is monitored by the Cottage staff through regular contact with the student's school and family. A point system has been instituted for the achievement of daily goals at the Cottage.

A number of other initiatives have also been implemented in various regions targeting students at risk of suspension.

In the Metropolitan South West region, thirty teachers have been trained in a "Youth Success" program, based on a U.S. program which has been adapted by National Curriculum and Training Inc. in South Australia. Each regional Education Resource Centre has a team to run the program, which targets students with a history of suspension. The program operates over three days with a group of six to eight students and involves social skills training, elements of Glasser's Reality Therapy and concentration skills. Control Theory and Reality Therapy are further discussed at Section 9.1.1.

A "levels" system of behaviour management has been implemented in a group of schools in the Riverina region which places students on tiered levels of achievement based on a points system.
Phase One of the program provides a process of gaining whole school community commitment to the program, examining current school practices, developing a plan based on school requirements and implementing and reviewing that plan over a period of one to two terms.

Phase Two involves a two hour unit each week for 10 weeks. Core units include preventing disruptive behaviour; increasing appropriate behaviour; and maintaining a positive classroom environment. The units have been designed so no outside training assistance is required, ensuring all schools can easily implement the program.

Both phases have been piloted in nine schools, primarily in the Metropolitan East region. A copy of the program has been distributed to all schools.

- **Conflict and Dispute Resolution Project**

The Specific Focus Programs Directorate in association with the Metropolitan North, South Coast and Hunter regions, has been conducting a dispute resolution pilot project during 1994. The project has been developed in conjunction with Community Justice Centres, and an evaluation has been completed. A final report is being produced which will refer to the variety of conflict resolution projects across the state.

- **Resolve Anti-violence Curriculum**

At Granville South High School a group of Year 9 students have trialed a ten week course developed by a special education lecturer at the University of Western Sydney, Jean Jenkin. The Resolve Curriculum examines social perceptions of violence, the origins and indicators of violence, statistical data on violence and the power of assertiveness and communication skills. Modules on violence and gender and violence in relationships are also included.

- **Playground Programs**

The Committee has heard that some schools running playground programs aim to identify disruptive students and give them positive leadership tasks to involve them in an advantageous way (Black Evidence, 26.04.94). During the course of the Inquiry, the Committee members visited Liverpool West Public School. The school identified a high incidence of aggressive behaviour in the playground and introduced the Playground Program emphasising preventative strategies such as:

- lunchtime leisure activities;
- the teaching of playground games;
- the availability of play equipment;
- special needs groups;
- behaviour modification;
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Aggressive School Troublemakers and Victims: A Longitudinal Model Examining the Pivotal Role of Self-Concept

Herbert W. Marsh, Roberto H. Parada, Alexander Seeshing Yeung, and Jean Healey
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Aggressive Troublemaker (getting into physical fights, getting into trouble, being seen as a troublemaker, and being punished for getting into trouble) and Victim (being threatened with harm, not feeling safe) factors were related to 3 components of self-concept (General, Same Sex, and Opposite Sex) based on the large, nationally representative National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 database. At 8th-, 10th-, and 12th-grade levels, Troublemaker and Victim constructs were reasonably stable over time and moderately positively correlated (many students were both troublemakers and victims). The Victim factor was negatively correlated with self-concept and had negative effects on subsequent self-concept. Whereas the Troublemaker factor was also correlated somewhat negatively with self-concept, it had small positive effects on subsequent self-concept: Low self-concept may trigger troublemaking behavior in a possibly successful attempt to enhance subsequent self-concept. Although boys had higher Troublemaker and Victim scores than did girls, the effects of these constructs on subsequent self-concepts were similar for boys and girls.

School aggression and acting out behaviors are a significant problem for schools around the world. School aggressive troublemaking (e.g., not following school rules, getting into physical fights, and being perceived as a troublemaker) may increase the likelihood of sanctions, risk of school failure (Wells & Raskin, 1983), and predispositions for criminal activity as adults (Babinski, Hartsough, & Lambert, 1999). Being a victim of school troublemakers and violence is associated with underachievement, psychological distress, depression, psychopathology, internalizing behaviors, and deteriorating physical health (Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Olweus, 1997).

The causes of and solutions to school troublemaking and victimization have been under intense scrutiny over the past 20 years (Smith & Brain, 2000). Gender differences have been found. Boys are more likely than girls to be troublemakers as well as victims (Boulton & Smith, 1994; Rigby & Slee, 1993). Girls, however, tend to engage in more covert forms of indirect aggressive behaviors, such as rumors, social rejection, and exclusion (Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996). Aggressive troublemaking behaviors are stable over time (Kumpulanen, Räisänen, & Henttonen, 1999; Salmivalli, Lappalainen, & Lagerspetz, 1998), although they are more frequent among younger than older students, and the same person can be both a perpetrator and a victim (Bosworth, Espelage, & Simon, 1999). There are, however, insufficient longitudinal studies to clarify the developmental patterns in relations among these constructs during adolescence.

Victims tend to have lower general self-concepts (Neary & Joseph, 1994; Rigby & Cox, 1996) and more negative self-perceptions of their social competence and acceptance by their peers (Callaghan & Stephen, 1995; Hawker & Boulton, 2000). Relations between aggressive troublemaking and self-concept are not as clear. Aggression is sometimes seen as a result of low self-concept (Wells & Raskin, 1983). Self-perceptions of being rejected by others may predispose a child to react aggressively when in an ambiguous social situation, whereas children with high self-concepts might be less threatened and therefore less likely to respond with aggression (Edens, Cavell, & Hughes, 1999; Hay, 2000). However, other research offers a more complicated perspective. Egan and Perry (1998) examined relations between general self-concept, social self-concept, victimization, and psychopathology (internalizing behaviors related to anxiety and depression; externalizing behaviors related to delinquent and aggressive behaviors such as stealing, lying, cheating, getting into fights, and threatening to hurt other people). Externalization was not significantly correlated to either general or social self-concept, whereas internalization was significantly negatively related to general, and particularly to social, self-concept. Victimization was more positively correlated with externalization than internalization and was more negatively correlated with social self-concept than general self-concept. In longitudinal analyses, there was evidence that low general self-concept, and low social self-concept in particular, were both causes and effects of victimization (i.e., prior levels of low self-concept led to increased victimization, whereas prior victimization led to lower subsequent levels of self-concept). Salmivalli (1998) reported that adolescent bullies tended to have moderate social and physical self-concepts, although views of themselves were more negative on the other self-
concept scales. In contrast, victims had low scores in most self-concept domains. Hay (2000) found that students who had been suspended from their schools for persistent behavior problems (e.g., in-class disruption, verbal or physical aggression) tended to score low in the areas of school, parent–child relationships, school–student connectedness, and total self-concept. However, boys in particular did not suffer from emotional instability or peer rejection. Robinson, Garber, and Hilsman (1995) reported that general self-concept predicted depressive symptoms but did not predict externalizing behaviors. Staub (1999; see also Jenkins, 1996) argued that the issue might not simply be the level of general self-concept but what it is based on. He proposed that aggressive children might not have the socially valued means to gain a positive self-image through competence and good performance such that they enhance their self-concept through strength, power, and physical domination of others. In summary, the relation between victimization and self-concept is consistently found to be negative—more so for social than general self-concept—but the direction of relations between self-concept and aggressive troublemaking is unclear.

Knowing the across-time causal pattern of relations among multiple dimensions of self-concept, school troublemaking, and being a victim would be of great importance for interventions aimed at reducing school violence (Jenkins, 1996). According to the self-concept deficit view, to reduce aggressive behaviors in schools, individual students' self-concept must be enhanced through mentoring, counseling, and relationship building. In contrast, according to the enhanced self-concept view, school troublemakers are reinforced for their antisocial behaviors such that there needs to be a change in the school ethos that inappropriately reinforces such behaviors (Jenkins, 1996; Rowland, 2000). According to this perspective, interventions that target individual students without changing the school ethos are likely to be ineffective.

According to self-concept theory (e.g., Marsh, 1990; Marsh & Craven, 1997), self-concept perceptions are formed through experience with and interpretation of one's physical, academic, and social environments. Social comparison processes are important in that students use performance of their classmates to establish frames of reference for evaluating their own performances as well as the evaluations of significant others (Marsh, 1990; Marsh & Craven, 1997). A paradox occurs when peers in a school accept troublemaking and associated violent behaviors. Troublemakers may achieve a personal sense of power and gain social reinforcement from their peers for troublemaking behaviors and the intimidation of their victims. Within this social context, aggressive troublemaking behavior and self-concept may be positively correlated. Although the use of aggression has been found to be associated with rejection by the peer group (Dodge, Coie, Pettit, & Price, 1990; Rubin, Chen, & Hymel, 1993), some aggressive children are popular with, and leaders of, aggressive cliques (Cairns, Cairns, Necker, Oest, & Gariety, 1988). These children also tend to overestimate their level of competence and the actual quality of their relationships with significant others (Edens et al., 1999, Rubin et al., 1993). So long as the school ethos allows aggressive students to enhance their self-concept through this behavior, interventions aimed at individual students are unlikely to be successful. When the school ethos is altered such that aggressive troublemaking is seen as an unacceptable form of behavior that is no longer condoned by parents, teachers, and other students, aggressive behaviors will no longer contribute to a positive self-concept. Conversely, through similar mechanisms, the stigmatization associated with being a victim of bullying has a negative effect on self-concept. We are unaware of studies that have examined over an extended period of time structural equation models (SEMs) of relations among school-related aggressive troublemakers, victimization, and specific aspects of self-concept. On the basis of the present review of related literature, we hypothesized that (a) the Troublemaker and Victim constructs are reasonably stable over the 4-year high school period; (b) there is substantial overlap between the Troublemaker and Victim constructs in that many students are both troublemakers and victims; (c) the Victim factor is negatively related to and has negative effects on general, and particularly on social, self-concepts; (d) troublemaking is negatively related to self-concept but may lead to higher levels self-concept (i.e., troublemaking is a possible strategy for low-self-concept students to enhance their self-concept); and (e) although girls have consistently lower Troublemaker and Victim scores than do boys, the factor structure underlying these constructs and their effects on self-concept are similar for boys and girls.

Method

National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS88) Data: Variables and Sample

The present investigation is based on selected variables from the publicly available NELS88 database. NELS88 is a multivariate, longitudinal study consisting of a large, nationally representative sample of U.S. students who were in eighth grade in 1988, with follow-up data collections in 1990 and 1992. In the present study, the total sample for analysis (using listwise deletion of missing data) was 10,708 (5,011 boys and 5,697 girls). Details about the database are available in the NELS88 user's manual (Ingles et al., 1992); we thus describe only the variables directly relevant to the present study (see the Appendix). Following Ingles et al. (1992), to compensate for sampling bias, the weights that take into account disproportionate sampling of specific subgroups was divided by an estimated design effect of 2.54 (Ingles et al., 1997, p. 51), reducing the weighted sample size to 4,216 (1,973 boys and 2,243 girls). The reduction of sample size, however, had no effect on the parameter estimates, although it led to more conservative tests of statistical significance.

Self-concept. Three different self-concept scales were considered: General, Opposite Sex, and Same Sex (see the Appendix). Consistent with our previous research (Marsh, 1990; Marsh & Craven, 1997), we use the term General self-concept instead of self-esteem to emphasize that General self-concept is an overarching component of self-concept rather than a domain-specific component like the Same Sex and Opposite Sex self-concept factors. Following Marsh (1996), General self-concept is inferred from the four positively worded items that are common to all three waves (Time 1 [T1], Time 2 [T2], and Time 3 [T3]) that were adapted from the Rosenberg (1965) scale for inclusion in the NELS88 database. The eight items used to represent the Same Sex and Opposite Sex self-concept scales were selected from the widely used Self Description Questionnaire (Marsh, 1990) for purposes of inclusion in the NELS88 database, but these items were collected at T2 only.

Troublemakers. The Troublemaker factor was defined in terms of students getting into physical fights, getting into trouble, being seen as troublemakers, and being punished for getting into trouble (see the Appendix). We used 13 self-reported troublemaking items from the NELS88 database for the three time points (4 for T1, 5 for T2, and 4 for T3). These items were substantially similar, but not completely parallel, for the three times (see the Appendix).
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Victims. The Victim factor was defined in terms of students indicating that they did not feel safe at school and having actually received a threat of physical harm by someone while at school. The same two items (see the Appendix) were used to assess this factor at T1, T2, and T3.

Statistical Analysis

SEM models were conducted with LISREL 8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993), using maximum likelihood estimation with listwise deletion for missing data. Following Marsh, Balla, and Hau (1996) and Marsh, Balla, & McDonald (1988), we emphasize the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the relative non-centrality index (RNI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) to evaluate goodness of fit, but we also present the chi-square test statistic and an evaluation of parameter estimates. TLI and RNI vary along a 0-to-1 continuum in which values greater than .90 and .95 are typically taken to reflect acceptable and excellent fit, respectively, to the data. For RMSEA, values less than .05 and .08 are taken to reflect a close fit and a reasonable fit, respectively. The RNI contains no penalty for a lack of parsimony such that improved fit due to the introduction of additional parameters may reflect capitalization on chance, whereas the TLI and RMSEA contain a penalty for a lack of parsimony.

In most applications of confirmatory factor analysis, a priori models assume that the residual variance (uniqueness plus random error; hereafter referred to as "uniquenesses") associated with each measured variable is independent of residual variances associated with other measured variables. However, when the same items are administered to the same participants on multiple occasions (e.g., the same General self-concept item at T1, T2, and T3), uniquenesses associated with the ratching items are likely to be correlated (hereafter referred to as "correlated uniquenesses"). Likewise, if two scales consist of items with parallel wording (e.g., "I make friends easily with girls"; "I make friends easily with boys"), then there are likely to be correlated uniquenesses. In each case, if there are substantial correlated uniquenesses that are not included in the model, then the estimated correlations between the corresponding latent constructs will be positively biased. However, their inclusion in the model provides a test for these correlated uniquenesses and a control for what might otherwise be a positive bias such that they should be included in the a priori model (Marsh & Hau, 1996).

We evaluated models with no correlated uniquenesses, with 2 correlated uniquenesses for items with parallel wording (for Same Sex and Opposite Sex scales), and with 25 correlated uniquenesses for the same items with exactly the same wording administered on different occasions. Because we argue a priori that such correlated uniquenesses should be included, and because their inclusion resulted in significantly better fits to the data, we focused on models with correlated uniquenesses. The inclusion of these correlated uniquenesses, however, had almost no effect on other parameter estimates and thus is not substantively important in the present investigation.

For purposes of the present investigation, we began with a SEM model (Model 1; see Figure 1) with 11 latent constructs defined by 39 measured variables (the items in the Appendix). The ordering of variables was based strictly on the temporal ordering of the variables in that all T1 variables preceded all T2 variables and all T2 variables preceded all T3 variables. No causal ordering of latent constructs within each wave was assumed, but correlations among these constructs were estimated. In Model 2, we added gender (1 = boys, 2 = girls) as the first variable in the path model to determine gender differences in each of the constructs.

In the final set of models, we evaluated whether the path models were similar for boys and girls (on the basis of separate covariance matrices for each gender). When there are parallel data from more than one group—boys and girls in this study—it is possible to test the invariance of the solution by requiring any one parameter estimate, any set of parameter estimates, or all parameter estimates to be the same in the two or more groups. The minimal condition of factorial invariance is the invariance of the factor loadings, but our main focus was on the tests of the equality of the path coefficients across boys and girls.

![Figure 1](image-url)

**Figure 1.** The causal model was posited strictly on the basis of temporal ordering of latent constructs. All statistically significant paths are shown (see Table 1 for the full set of parameter estimates). Critical paths for purposes of this study are shaded in gray. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3; Estm = self-esteem; Trbl = trouble perpetrators; Vict = victim; OSex = opposite-sex self-concept; SSex = same-sex self-concept.
Results

Patterns of Relations Among Troublemaker, Victim, and Self-Concept Factors

Model 1 resulted in a good fit to the data (Table 1) and parameter estimates that were consistent with a priori predictions (Table 2; see also Figure 1). Both Troublemaker and Victim constructs were reasonably stable over this high school period, which spans much of adolescence (see factor correlations). The int-retest correlations over each 2-year period varied from .53 to .65 and tended to be as large as, or slightly larger than, those associated with General self-concept (.53, .55). Consistent with a priori predictions that the same individuals are frequently both troublemakers and victims, the correlations between the Troublemaker and Victim factors were moderately positive (.40 to .53 for T1, T2, and T3). The Victim factor was negatively correlated with General, Opposite Sex, and Same Sex self-concepts. Although correlations between these self-concept factors and Troublemaker were also negative, the sizes of the correlations were smaller (and not statistically significant for Opposite Sex self-concept).

A major focus of this study was on the path coefficients relating the Troublemaker and Victim factors to the three self-concept factors (Figure 1; see also Table 2). T1 Victim had consistently negative effects on all three T2 self-concept constructs (General, -.17; Opposite Sex, -.19; Same Sex, -.35). In contrast, T1 Troublemaker had statistically significant positive effects on T2 General self-concept (.09) and Opposite Sex self-concept (.12) and a significant effect on Same Sex self-concept (.04). However, Troublemaker and Victim factors had almost no statistically significant direct effects on T3 General self-concept. T1 trouble-making had a small, significantly positive effect on T3 General self-concept (.07), but T2 Troublemaker and Victim factors had no additional significant effects. The effects of the Troublemaker and Victim factors were stronger during early adolescence than during later adolescence.

Gender Differences

In Model 2, we addressed the question of the gender differences in each of the constructs considered in Model 1. For this purpose, gender was added to the SEM and was posited to come first in the causal ordering (see Table 3). For all three waves, girls had significantly lower scores for the General self-concept, Troublemaker, and Victim factors. The directions of these gender differences were consistent over T1, T2, and T3 (General self-concept: -.18, -.12, -.13; Victim: -.23, -.20, -.16; Troublemaker: -.31; -.28; -.24), although gender differences became somewhat smaller with age. In contrast, there were very small (statistically significant) differences favoring girls for Same Sex and Opposite Sex self-concepts (.05, .04). The path coefficients relating gender to each of the T2 and T3 constructs (Table 3) differed from factor correlations in that they represented the effects of gender at T2 and T3 beyond the effects that could be explained in terms of T1 or T2 constructs (i.e., the direct effects of gender rather than the total effects). Not surprisingly, the negative effects of gender on General self-concept, Troublemaker, and Victim factors at T2 and T3 were smaller after controlling for the negative effects of gender on earlier constructs. Other path coefficients in Model 2 (Table 3) were similar to those in Model 1 (see Table 2 and Figure 1).

In Model 3, we tested whether Troublemaker and Victim factors are similarly defined for boys and girls and whether these factors had similar effects for boys and girls. To pursue this question, we conducted a traditional test of factorial invariance across the separate SEM solutions based on responses by boys and girls. In Model 3A (Table 1), no invariance constraints were imposed so that all parameter estimates were allowed to differ for boys and girls. This model provided a baseline against which to compare subsequent models that required some parameter estimates to be the same for boys and girls. On the basis of the goodness-of-fit indexes that controlled for model parsimony (TLI and RMSEA in Table 1), there was good support for the invariance of factor loadings across boys and girls (Model 3B): The latent constructs,
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Table 2
Path Model 1: Factor Loading, Factor Correlations, and Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>T1 factors</th>
<th>T2 factors</th>
<th>T3 factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estm</td>
<td>Trbl</td>
<td>Vict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1Estm</th>
<th>T1Trbl</th>
<th>T1Vict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Estm</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Trbl</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Vict</td>
<td>-31*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2SmSex</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2OpSex</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Estm</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Trbl</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Vict</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Path coefficients (from column to raw factors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2Estm</th>
<th>T2Trbl</th>
<th>T2Vict</th>
<th>T2SmSex</th>
<th>T2OpSex</th>
<th>T3Estm</th>
<th>T3Trbl</th>
<th>T3Vict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values of 1 and 0 were fixed in the model. Parameter estimates are completely standardized. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3; Estm = Esteem; Trbl = Troublemaker; Vict = Victim; SmSex = Same Sex self-concept; OpSex = Opposite Sex self-concept. *p < .05.

Discussion and Implications

The present investigation examined a longitudinal SEM of relations among aggressive school troublemakers, victims, and multiple dimensions of self-concept for a large, nationally representative sample of students in the 8th, 10th, and 12th grades. We pursued a construct validation approach in which we demonstrated (a) the ability of our a priori factor structure to fit the data; (b) reasonable stability for the Troublemaker and Victim constructs over the 4 years of high school; (c) support for a series of a priori, apparently paradoxical predictions derived from our review of previous research; and (d) evidence of the generalizability of the findings over responses by boys and girls.

Consistent with predictions and the available literature, our Troublemaker and Victim constructs were reasonably stable over the substantial adolescent period during which students attend high school. For example, these constructs were slightly more stable over time than was the General self-concept, which is typically assumed to be a trait-like construct. Furthermore, the substantial stability between 8th and 10th grade was based on a period when many students would have made at least one major change in schools. Thus, although there may have been substantial situational and contextual aspects associated with these constructs, there were also substantial individual differences that generalized over time and situation.

Troublemakers and victims were clearly not discrete groups. There was a substantial positive correlation between these constructs, indicating that many troublemakers were also victims and vice versa. Although possibly surprising, this positive relation between these two constructs is consistent with earlier research and was consistent across all three waves in the present investiga-
Table 3
Path Model 2: Path Coefficients and Factor Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>T1 factors</th>
<th>T2 factors</th>
<th>T3 factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Estm</td>
<td>Trbl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Estm</td>
<td>-1.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Trbl</td>
<td>-3.1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Vict</td>
<td>-2.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Estm</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Trbl</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Vict</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2SmSex</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2OpSex</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Estm</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Trbl</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Vict</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Path coefficients (from column to row factors)

Factor correlations

| Gender | 1.00   | -1.18* | -3.1* | -2.23* | -1.28* | -2.0* | .05*  | .04*  | -.13* | -.24* | -.16* |

Note. For gender, 1 = boys and 2 = girls. Parameter estimates are completely standardized. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3; Estm = Esteem; Trbl = Troublemaker; Vict = Victum; SmSex = Same Sex self-concept; OpSex = Opposite Sex self-concept.

We suggest that these two behavioral constructs are mutually reinforcing. Thus, for example, victims of school violence may have been more likely to model this behavior in relations with others who were potentially weaker (e.g., to be the perpetrators of violence against weaker groups of students within the school). Likewise, aggressive troublemakers may have been more likely to find themselves in situations in which they were the victims of the aggressive behaviors of others such that they became victims. For example, Whitney, Nabuzoka, and Smith (1992) suggested that some victims, because of their lack of peer support and protection from violent behavior, act in an aggressive manner and become perpetrators. To paraphrase a well-known adage, those who live by aggressive troublemaking behavior are likely to be victims of aggressive troublemaking behavior. Although clearly beyond the scope of the present investigation, there is a need for further research of these and other explanations for the positive correlation between the Troublemaker and Victim constructs.

Not surprisingly, the Victim factor was consistently negatively associated with self-concepts at 8th, 10th, and 12th grades. Furthermore, the effects of prior victim status on subsequent self-concept reinforced this pattern of negative relations: Higher T1 Victim scores led to lower General, Same Sex, and Opposite Sex self-concepts at T2. However, the effects of T1 Victim were more negative for T2 Same Sex self-concepts than for T2 General and Opposite Sex self-concepts. Victims perceived more condemnation of their victim status by their same-sex peers than by their opposite-sex peers. It is important to note that support for the invariance of the path coefficients over gender indicated that this pattern of effects was similar for boys and for girls.

The pattern of relations between the Troublemaker and self-concept factors was quite different from those observed with the Victim factor. Although the Troublemaker factor tended to be negatively correlated with the self-concept factors in 8th, 10th, and 12th grades, the sizes of these correlations were small and sometimes were not even statistically significant. More important, the coefficients leading from the T1 Troublemaker factor to the self-concept factors tended to be positive—not negative, as we might predict by the self-concept deficiency view. Consistent with our review of the available literature, the pattern of relations varies somewhat as a function of the particular component of self-concept. Whereas the largest (negative) effect of the T1 Vict factor was on Same Sex self-concept, the positive effect of the Troublemaker factor was largest for Opposite Sex self-concept (and not statistically significant for Same Sex self-concept). Troublemakers seemed to perceive more support for their behavior from opposite-sex peers than from same-sex peers, and this pattern was similar for boys and for girls.

On the basis of speculations by other researchers and limited previous research (reviewed earlier), we postulated a mediation whereby low self-concept is a trigger for pursuing troublemaking behavior (hence the negative correlation). Thus, low-self-concept students seek strategies to enhance their self-concept. One such strategy might be to engage in troublemaking behavior. The positive effects of prior troublemaking on subsequent self-concept suggest, at least in the mind of some troublemakers, this strategy may have been successful. This may occur, for example, because of the positive attention that is given to troublemakers by other students, particularly by members of the opposite sex. Because this reinforcement may be based only on the possibility that troublemakers interpret attention by passive bystanders as signal approval that enhances self-concept. If our conjectures are correct, then the way to get is by countering this pattern is for old students to actively demand and reinforce (albeit inadvertently) the troublemaking behaviors. When it becomes clear that potential troublemakers that their behaviors do not result in sig-
approval that will enhance their self-concept, the incidence of such behaviors is likely to decline.

Being a troublemaker may be an effective strategy for countering a low self-concept in early adolescence (between T1 and T2), but it may not be effective in later adolescence (T3) as students become older, more mature, and better able to judge the consequences of their antisocial behaviors and others’ perceptions of their behavior. Although we did not predict a priori this developmental pattern of different effects at T3 than those at T2, it seems a reasonable finding and one that is worth pursuing in further research. Again, we offer these speculations as one possible direction of further research into the mechanisms underlying the results of the present investigation.

It is relevant to note that many of the effects observed in the present investigation are not large, even though they are theoretically and substantively important. The results are theoretically important in that the directions of the effects are consistent with a priori predictions, even though they are apparently paradoxical (i.e., negative externalizing, antisocial, troublemaking behaviors led to higher self-concepts). Hence, the direction of this effect is more important than its size. Whereas many effects of the Troublemaker and Victim factors are modest in size, there is no question that they are highly significant in a statistical sense, have wide generalizability (because of the use of a nationally representative sample), and may be practically significant (e.g., the effects of the Victim factor on Same Sex self-concept, r = .35). Even more important, the direction of the effects of the Troublemaker and Victim factors are opposite to each other (Victim effects are negative, Troublemaker effects are positive) even though these two factors are substantially correlated with each other. Hence, the pattern of effects and the differences (e.g., positive effects of Troublemaker vs. negative effects of Victim) are theoretically and substantively important even though the effect sizes are modest.

There are also potential limitations (associated with using the NELS 88 database) in the present investigation. With existing data, we had to rely on the best available items to infer each construct. In the present investigation, for example, the measures of General, Same Sex, and Opposite Sex self-concepts seemed appropriate, but it was disappointing that only the General self-concept items were collected at T1, T2, and T3 (Same Sex and Opposite Sex items were collected at T2 only). Although Troublemaker items were collected in all three waves, some of the items used to infer this construct differed slightly from one wave to the next. Also, whereas it is reasonable to assume that the Troublemaker items refer to the active perpetration of violent and inappropriate behaviors, behaviors such as getting into fights can happen to passive victims as well as active perpetrators. Whereas the Victim items were less ambiguous and were consistent across the three waves, this construct was defined by only two items for each wave. It must be noted, however, that studies of relations between victimization and self-concept have typically used single-item scales (e.g., Boulton & Smith, 1994; Callaghan & Stephen, 1995; Neary & Joseph, 1994), suggesting that the measurement in this area of research is not strong. Finally, particularly for the Troublemaker and Victim constructs, it would have been useful if we had been able to cross-validate the self-report responses with the responses of significant others (e.g., other students, teachers, and parents).

There are, however, important advantages to using the NELS 88 database: We did not have to base conclusions on small, idiosyncratic samples of convenience, and the data are readily available to other researchers to pursue alternative interpretations. Support for the construct validity of our interpretations (the a priori factor structure, the match between the content of items and the inferred factors, the stability of the factors over time, the generalizability of the results over gender, and the a priori predictions based on previous theory and research) adds strong support to the variables chosen and their interpretation. More generally, particularly in this area of research, there is a need for large, nationally representative survey studies like the present investigation, smaller survey studies based on tailor-made instruments that may use samples of convenience, intervention studies, and qualitative case studies. Within this broader framework, our study makes an important contribution.

In summary, our study demonstrates the complex relations between self-concept and aggressive school troublemaking and victimization. Low self-concept was associated with aggressive school behavior, which we posit is an attempt to counter the negative self-concept that triggered it. For some of these students, apparently, this strategy worked. In contrast, being a victim was clearly associated with low self-concept. Victims were in a vicious circle in which they started out with lower self-concepts, and their victim status led to further declines in self-concept. Furthermore, troublemakers and victims were not distinct groups in that many troublemakers were also victims and vice versa. Despite changing schools and experiencing the many psychological and developmental changes during adolescence, aggressive school troublemaking and being a victim were surprisingly stable over a substantial portion of adolescence. This stability suggests the need for early intervention into the prevention of school-related aggressive behaviors (Jenkin, 1996). Further research is needed, however, to replicate our findings, to validate our interpretations, and to test our speculations about the need for ecological interventions at the school level that actively discourage aggressive means to gain peer acceptance and enhance self-concept.

References


# Appendix

**National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS88) Variables Considered in This Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor and NELS88 variable</th>
<th>Item wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General self-esteem response items (4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Esmt</td>
<td>BYS44A I feel good about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYS44D I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYS44B I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYS44H On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Esmt</td>
<td>F1662A I feel good about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1662D I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1662E I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1662H On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Esmt</td>
<td>F2666A I feel good about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2666D I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2666E I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2666H On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Self-concept items (6 = true to 1 = false)** |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------|
| For boys SSsex | F1563C I have good friends who are members of my own sex. |
|        | F1563L I make friends easily with boys. |
|        | F1563P I do not get along very well with boys. (reverse scored) |
|        | F1563R It is difficult to make friends with members of my own sex. (reverse scored) |
| OSsex | F1563H I get a lot of attention from members of the opposite sex. |
|        | F1563K I make friends easily with girls. |
|        | F1563Q I do not get along very well with girls. (reverse scored) |
|        | F1563T I’m not very popular with members of the opposite sex. (reverse scored) |

| For girls SSsex | F1563C I have good friends who are members of my own sex. |
|        | F1563L I make friends easily with girls. |
|        | F1563O I do not get along very well with girls. (reverse scored) |
|        | F1563R It is difficult to make friends with members of my own sex. (reverse scored) |
| OSsex | F1563H I get a lot of attention from members of the opposite sex. |
|        | F1563L I make friends easily with boys. |
|        | F1563P I do not get along very well with boys. (reverse scored) |
|        | F1563T I’m not very popular with members of the opposite sex. (reverse scored) |

| Troublemakers T1Tribl | BYS55A I was sent to the office because I was misbehaving. |
|                      | BYS55E My parents received a warning about my behavior. |
|                      | BYS55F I got into a physical fight with other students. |
|                      | BYS55G Other students see me as a troublemaker. |
| T2Tribl | F1810C I got into trouble for not following the school rules. |
|        | F1810D I was put on an in-school suspension. |
|        | F1810E I was suspended or put on probation from school. |
|        | F1819D I got into a physical fight at school. |
|        | Other students see me as a troublemaker. |
| T3Tribl | F289D I was put on an in-school suspension. |
|        | F289F I was suspended or put on probation from school. |
|        | F289H I got into a physical fight at school. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization response items (3 = more than twice/often to 1 = never)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NELS88 variables labels are those used in the actual NELS88 database (Ingles et al., 1992). T1 = Time 1; Esmt = esteem; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3; SSsex = Same Sex self-concept; OSsex = Opposite Sex self-concept; Tribl = Troublemaker; Vic = Victim.
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Abstract

Bullying is endemic in high schools in Australia and overseas, particularly in the early years (Byrne 1993; Olweus 1990; Rigby & Slee 1991; Sharp & Smith 1991.). Specific groups or individuals may be targeted and bullies often focus attention on salient features of the victim to ensure the greatest impact of their victimisation. This study examines the experiences of bullying of Asian and non-Asian students at a girls’ high school in northern Sydney. Differences and similarities between the groups on various measures of bullying including type, frequency, intensity and impact were analysed with particular attention to racially-based incidents. The data show that although there is a perception that Asian students endure more bullying, in this study Asian and non-Asian students are bullied to almost exactly the same degree. However, Asian students are more likely to be bullied more intensively (how regularly it happens) and at higher rates (number of incidents per student) than their non-Asian peers, although racially-based bullying was not indicated. This suggests the need for whole school and comprehensive intervention in general bullying as well as individual intervention and remediation.
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Introduction and Rationale

Over the past ten years, bullying has become a major focus of research and concern in schools (Besag, 1989; Pepler, Craig, Ziegler & Charach, 1993; Rigby & Slee, 1991, ). During this time definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, differentiating bullying behaviour from violence, fighting, play and general conflict on a number of critical dimensions:

reciprocity—bullying involves the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who is not aggressive in return. The lack of reciprocity differentiates bullying from fighting and conflict (Besag, 1994; Jenkin, 1995, ).

repetition—bullying involves more than one event often occurring as a pattern of hurtful behaviour over a period of time, which differentiates it from episodic violence or assault (Olweus, 1991).

intentionality—the purpose of bullying is to harm the recipient. Intentionality must be examined in relation to the claimed intention of the bully which is often to diminish the purpose, the actual impact on the victim and the congruence of the two. If the victim is hurt, the victim is bullied. (Quine 1999)
power—there is an unmistakable power differential between the bully and victim, which does not always correlate with the size, age or social status of the bully or victim. Effective bullies may be smaller, younger or less socially powerful than the victim— their power being based in their propensity to engage in threatening anti-social behaviour.

Defining School Bullying

There has been a need established to operationally define school bullying. Over the past ten years, bullying in schools has also become a major focus of international research and concern (Besag, 1994; Harachi, Catalano & Hawkins, 1999; Pepler, Craig, Zeigler & Carach, 1993; Pepler & Craig, 1995). It has been established that bullying is endemic in high schools in Australia and overseas with up to 13% of all students reporting bullying (Byrne, 1993; Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 1996). Up to 25% of boys in primary schools report being frequently bullied and 27% have engaged in physically, psychologically or verbally bullying behaviour on three or more occasions (Alsaker & Bruner, 1999; de Almeida, 1999). A surprising degree of consistency is evident in the international literature relating to bullying in high schools with an overall 10 to 13% of students reporting involvement as either a bully or victim. Bullying is reported to peak during the early years of high school, and gradually diminish as students develop a more mature sense of empathy and a willingness to support those being victimised (Rigby & Slee, 1993a). Furthermore, cultural (Morita, Soeda, Soeda & Taki, 1999), gender and age differences can be demonstrated in more recent work by this author.
Specific groups or individuals may be targeted and bullies often focus attention on salient features of the victim to ensure the greatest impact of their victimisation.

Importantly, the social costs of long-term bullying are now readily apparent with suicide (Olweus, 1999), murder (Burnage, 1989), attempted murder (Healey, 2001b) and serious psychological problems documented internationally as resultant consequences of violent and bullying behaviour. Despite consistent research findings pointing to the pervasiveness of school bullying, Harachi et al. (1999) contend that “there appears to be no one standard definition of bullying in the popular or research literature” (p. 298). Definitions which have been adopted and formed the basis of current research have ranged from the simple to the complex, including those of the following researchers:

A student is being bullied or victimised when he or she is exposed repeatedly over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. (Olweus, 1993)

Bullying is repeated aggression, verbal psychological or physical conducted by an individual or group against others. (Byrne, 1993)

Bullying is repeated aggression, psychological or physical, of a less powerful person by a more powerful person or group of persons. (Rigby, 1996)

Bullying is a behaviour which can be defined as the repeated attack—physical, psychological, social or verbal by those in a position of power which is formally or situationally defined on those who are powerless to resist with the intention of causing distress for their own gain or gratification. (Besag, 1994)
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The latter definition seems to incorporate a wide range of key elements and as such seems to represent a more comprehensive definition. Whilst various definitions of what constitutes bullying abound, such definitions generally incorporate similar components of bullying including the repetitive nature of the abuse; the range of behaviours including psychological, physical and verbal aggression; the intention to inflict harm on the victim; and power differences.

Over time, definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, and a number of critical dimensions now differentiate bullying behaviour from violence, fighting, play and general conflict. As an outcome of analysis of student comments in relation to bullying and a re-examination of current literature, it would seem that at least two more factors define bullying. A lack of reciprocity was identified as a key factor whereby bullying is conceptualised to involve the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who, though sometimes resistant, is not aggressive in return. Attention to the factor of lack of reciprocity enables the differentiation of bullying from fighting and conflict (Besag, 1994; Healey, 2001a, see Appendix 4.6.2), an interpretation that teachers often find difficult to accept or identify.

To address this issue, the following operational definition is now proposed as a perhaps more sophisticated and comprehensive statement of what constitutes bullying:

Bullying involves the repeated, intentionally harmful, psychological or physical actions of one or more socially powerful individuals against an individual who cannot effectively resist and who does not reciprocate the actions.
Prevalence

A surprising degree of consistency is evident in the international literature relating to bullying in high schools with an overall 10-13% of students reporting involvement as either a bully or victim. (Byrne, 1993; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Sharp & Smith, 1991). Bullying is also reported to peak during the early years of high school, gradually diminishing as students develop a more mature sense of empathy and a willingness to support those being victimised (Slee, 1993; Rigby & Slee, 1990). Other research by this author establishes a high incidence of bullying in co-educational, all female and denominational schools in a specific survey population at 18.8% (Healey, 1999). This research was able to differentiate bullying on a range of dimensions including significant cultural diversity in the experience of bullying. The survey identified over 80 categories of cultural background and compared the data from student self-reports of bullying while at high school.

Racially-based bullying is rarely reported in the literature as such, but is often referred to as harassment or discrimination. Provided the behaviours described satisfy the criteria established for bullying, the terms may be interchangeable.

The literature is sparse for Asian students outside their own countries, but researchers discussing the level of bullying of Asian students in foreign countries examine such phenomena as the impact on self-esteem (Chan, 1997), the effects of pressure to perform (Rogers, 1998; Sawano, 1997) and racial abuse (Loach and Bloor, 1995). This study is among the first to examine differential rates of bullying for Asian and non-Asian students in Australia.
A further salient feature of this study is that all respondents were female. The literature relating to female bullying compared to male bullying identifies differences in the types, rates and intensity of the behaviour. Indirect or covert forms of bullying such as exclusion, spreading rumours and undermining status are most likely to be evident in the bullying of and by females (Artz, 1997; Besag 1994; Pepler et al 1994).

Contradictory findings have resulted from research into the physical features of those who are victims of bullying, but even in the earliest years of childhood, the bully and victim can be identified. Children who are ‘different’ in appearance, due to disability, ethnicity or even fashion, can be singled out for adverse attention, (Randall, 1991). Some researchers discuss the disadvantage of perceived physical weakness as a factor in the bullying of boys (Olweus 1980), but this is much less an issue for girls, for whom physical attractiveness is a much more salient condition. (Byrne, 1993; Bjorkvist, K, Ekwan, K., Lagerspetz, K 1982). Hess (1998) suggests that “boy bullies are popular, girl bullies are not”, however the data gathered for this project indicate that female bullies are often described as those individuals who are popular, attractive and socially of high standing.

Bullies require empathy and responsibility training not social skills.

Psychologically, victims of bullying retain the effects long after the acts are over resulting in withdrawal, depression and adjustment problems often throughout their lives.
Bullying of Asian Students

Victims behave as abandoned, anxious, mistrustful individuals which behaviours may well sustain their status as victims. (Olweus, 1991). It is obvious and well documented that bullies will select their targets on the basis of their perceived lack of self-esteem and assertiveness, since this ensures that the behaviours are unlikely to be reported, the Australian cultural tradition of viewing reporting as 'dobbing', irrespective of the seriousness of the misdemeanour, sustains the impact and behaviour of the bully. Teachers often interpret legitimate reporting of inappropriate or even harmful behaviours as insignificant 'tattling', fail to intervene and therefore leave the victim without a supportive network for protection.

Interest in the bullying of Asian students arose as a direct result of a perceived rise in the level of anti-Asian sentiment in Australia in the wake of publicity about anti-immigration and anti-Asian policies and philosophy of a newly formed conservative political party.

Methodology

The beliefs, attitudes, perceptions and behaviours of students at a Catholic girls' college in northern Sydney in relation to bullying were gathered by means of the School Safety Survey (adapted Jenkin, 1997), in response to a request from the school executive.

Questionnaire: The survey (see appendix 1) comprises ten questions relating specifically to experiences and observations of bullying and safety in high school.
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Although the questionnaire was not designed specifically to differentiate racial bullying, the data permitted analysis of this issue due to the demographic details recorded. The questionnaire had been previously pilot-tested on a high school population in regional NSW and the order, wording and number of questions modified as a result. Questions relate to behaviours (what bullying occurs, Question 4,) what the student would do (Questions 6, 8, 9), beliefs or what students think about what is happening in the school, (Questions 5, 7, 10) and attitudes (what students think ought to happen, Question 9), as well as gathering relevant demographic data about gender, country of birth and year level (Questions 1, 2, 3).

The survey gives respondents the opportunity to identify the frequency and intensity of bullying experienced through a rating scale. The scale comprises five categories of regularity of bullying, with only the categories which fit the parameters of the bullying definition in relation to persistent or repeated behaviour. These categories were 'Daily or more often,' 'most days' 'weekly', withbehaviours reported in the categories 'occasionally' and 'never' excluded from the bullying data. Eight key behaviours most frequently reported by bullied students (Besag, 1989; Rigby & Slee, 1995,) were listed. Students were also asked to complete two rating scales which recorded their perceptions on the seriousness of the problem at the school and the morale of students.
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Respondents-

The school has a very diverse population in terms of nationalities with 38 different cultures represented in the two year groups selected for this study (year 7 and year 9), including 8 Asian countries. These year groups were selected as representative of the early years where bullying is most prevalent in high schools.

Students were identified as Asian if they were the children of one or more Asian parents, irrespective of where they were born or they were Asian born of Asian parents including China, Japan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Thailand, Burma Phillipines, all of which countries were nominated by respondents. This was not done to deny Australian-born students their citizenship of Australia, but in recognition of the likelihood that bullies who wish to bully Asian students do so on the basis of their appearance, without actually verifying their nationality.

Table 1 records the elements of the respondent population.

Procedure

The survey was distributed throughout the school to all teachers. The data from the whole school survey was used to produce a comprehensive report about bullying in the school. All students completed the survey at the same time, all surveys were then collected and sealed in envelopes for return to the researcher. However for this research only the results of the nominated year groups were examined. The data for years 7&9 were selected for this study which is part of a larger study of bullying in high schools.
Students were identified as Asian or non-Asian on the basis of the demographic data (country of birth of self and/or parents) and their responses were then further separated into those who reported being bullied and those who did not. An initial univariate and descriptive analysis examines the frequency, types and degree of bullying reported. A multi-variate analysis is then used to determine correlations to nationality and bullying.

**Research hypotheses**

It was hypothesised that:

1. Students who are Asian or who look Asian would be more likely to experience bullying than non-Asian students

2. Asian students would report a greater level of bullying overall

3. Asian students would report greater levels of intensity of bullying in the specific behaviours: ‘comments on your family or country of birth’ (Question 4.2) ‘comments about the way you look’ (Question 4.7)

4. Asian students would be more likely to perceive bullying at the school to be a serious problem

5. Asian students would identify non-Asian students in response to the question ‘who is a bully at this school?’

6. Asian and non-Asian students would identify Asian students as being in the group ‘who is bullied at this school?’.
Results

Tables 2 & 3 describe the incidence of bullying for Asian and non-Asian respondents and clearly indicate that both categories of student are bullied to almost the same degree—25% of Asian students reported being bullied and 24% of non-Asian students did also.

Table 4 provides information in relation to the frequency of bullying and how regularly it occurred (intensity). Fundamentally, if several incidences of bullying are spread over a week or several days, they will not be so intensively experienced as the same number of incidences spread over one day, which appears to be the experience of Asian students in year 7. In the highest category of intensity, 'once or more per day', year 7 Asian students reported a mean of 1.4 incidences, while non-Asian students reported a mean of .8, indicating that Asian students were bullied more intensively. In year 9, no Asian student reported this level of intensity, but non-Asian students yielded a mean of .7 incidences at this high level of intensity. In the moderate level of intensity, 'most days', Asian students in year 7 reported a mean number of behaviours at .4 but non-Asian students reported .6 incidents each.

Year 9 Asian students again reported no incidences at this level of intensity but non-Asian students reported a mean of .4. At the lower level of regularity of bullying, 'weekly', year 7 Asian students had a mean of .2 experiences while non-Asian peers reported .3.
Overall, the picture is of a low level of both frequency and intensity for the respondents, and the data indicate that although Asian students were no more likely to experience bullying than their non-Asian peers, they were likely to report a higher number of incidences at a higher level of intensity, in year 7.

Table 5 indicates which behaviours were experienced. It was hypothesised that Asian students would be more likely to report that ‘comments about your family or country of birth’ (item 4.2) and ‘comments about the way you look’ (item 4.7), were types of bullying they endured. However, the data reveal that in year 7 for item 4.2, no bullied Asian student reported this behaviour. By contrast, 50% of bullied Asian students in year 9 did report the behaviour while none of the non-Asian bullied students did. In relation to item 4.7, the data show that more non-Asian than Asian bullied students reported receiving comments about the way they look (58% in year 7 and 59% in year 9), with just 20% of Asian students reporting this behaviour. The hypothesised result that ‘comments about your family or country of birth’ would be a form of bullying experienced by Asian students did not, therefore, hold true for year 7 students, but was well supported for year 9.

Bullied Asian students were more likely to report being teased and called names to a very large degree - 80%, but the survey does not provide for a description of the types of names used, so no comment can be made about the racial or other focus of the name-calling. However, non-Asian students also report a high level of name-calling at 50% in year 7 and 47% in year 9. No year 9 Asian bullied students reported this behaviour.
Disturbingly, Asian students bullied in year 7 were far more likely to report physical bullying (item 4.5-hit, kicked punched) at 20% compared to 6% of non-Asian bullied students. No Asian student reported this form of bullying in year 9 but 18% of non-Asian students did. The variation cannot be accounted for in terms of the different age levels, therefore, on the assumption that older (and bigger/stronger) students would not be physically bullied, and may simply be a feature of the preferred type of bullying for the set of students in the year group. Asian students were also more likely to report demands to surrender goods or articles as a form of bullying (item 4.6) at 20%, than were non-Asian students at 16%-both of which results indicate a high level of the more overt and threatening types of bullying behaviour, usually not associated with female bullying. The next most serious type of behaviour reported, for all bullied students was damage to personal property (item 4.8) with all bullied students reporting this had occurred and with Asian students reporting very high rates of 40% (year 7) and 50% (year 9) and non-Asian respondents in year 7 a quite high level at 22%. For non-Asian students, item 4.3-‘being left out of things on purpose’ (exclusion) was a major source of concern at 42% for year 7 and 41% for year 9, however, no Asian student reported this form of bullying. Thus the hypothesised result that ‘comments on country of birth’ (item 4.2) would be a form of bullying experienced by Asian students did hold true, for year 9 Asian students.

Table 6 refers to student assessments of the seriousness of the problem of bullying at the school, and supports the hypothesis that Asian students would be more likely to express the belief that bullying was a serious problem.
Nevertheless, most students both Asian and non-Asian thought that bullying was not a minor problem.

The data regarding the identity of bullies and victims yielded specific names and descriptors, but it was not possible to differentiate Asian and non-Asian students from the data. The questions were open-ended and students were very forthcoming in recording the perceived characteristics of bullies and victims. Bullies were generally described in positive terms such as 'popular, attractive, having lots of friends,' and this reinforces the view that bullies are not, in fact, people with low social status or esteem, but are often quite the opposite. Victims were described using a wide variety of unattractive epithets including 'nerds, skinny, wimps, dummies' etc, revealing very little empathy among the respondents. In year 7, 1.3% of non-Asian respondents identified Asian students as being likely to be bullied, and in year 9, 4.3% did also. Overall, however there was little data to support the hypotheses that Asian students would be identified as those who were bullied or that non-Asian students would be identified as bullies, and this was probably a shortcoming of the specific questions.

Discussion

In summary, Asian students at this school were bullied to almost the same degree as their non-Asian peers, but were likely to experience more intensive bullying more frequently. There were differences in the types of bullying experienced, but Asian students did not report bullying which related specifically to their ethnicity.
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Victims were often described in derogatory terms with particular reference to weight, unfashionableness in terms of hair or clothing styles and as having generally unacceptable standards of 'coolness'. They were seen in this unsympathetic light particularly by older respondents in this study. However they were not described in terms of their cultural origins as was hypothesised. The data gathered here reinforces the notion that bullies are socially competent, although their behaviour is usually dominant (Rigby, 1997). The bullies in this study were invariably described as 'popular'—this term being the favoured descriptor for the majority of respondents. However this was not interpreted as meaning that bullies are, in fact popular, but in effect that popular students have the social power to engage in bullying.

A comprehensive approach to management has been described (Jenkin 1997, Slee 1996) and future research efforts should be directed towards development of this form of intervention.
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### Table 1: Sample of students responding to survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian students</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Asian students</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.2%)</td>
<td>(86.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Students who reported bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>students reporting bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullied students who are Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td>(10.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullied students who are non-Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86.2%)</td>
<td>(89.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Rate of bullying for Asian and non-Asian students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian students in survey population</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian students reporting bullying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(10.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian students in survey population</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian students reporting bullying</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>non-Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once or more per day</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Reports of bullying by Asian and non-Asian students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Behaviour Survey Question 4</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>non-Asian</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 teased and called names</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 comments on family,</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country of birth, religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 left out on purpose</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 threats</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 hit, kicked, punched</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 forced to give money or</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 comments on the way</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 personal property damaged</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or destroyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Percentage of students reporting each behaviour
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Problem, Purpose and Objectives

The extent and impact of bullying amongst students (particularly adolescents) in schools has been a subject of much recent interest in both the research literature and public discourse (eg. Batsche & Knoff, 1994; Farrington 1993; Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 2000; Smith & Sharp, 1994; Tatum & Tatum, 1992). Despite this, few studies have attempted to systematically investigate students’ experiences of, perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying. Moreover, very few studies have attempted to explicitly identify how students’ experiences and perceptions of bullying may be related to individual factors (such as a student’s age, gender, or cultural background), or school factors (such as school type and school climate).

The present research explicitly seeks to address these deficiencies in the literature. Specifically, this research attempts to:

(a) quantify students’ experiences of bullying,

(b) determine students’ perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying,

(c) demonstrate how these experiences and perceptions are related (if at all) to students’ age, gender and/or cultural backgrounds, and

(d) demonstrate how students’ experiences and perceptions of bullying are related (if at all) to the type of school, and the climate of the school, they attend.

The overall purpose of the research is to contribute to the development of a sound empirical basis for understanding students’ experiences and perceptions of bullying From
this basis appropriate and accountable policies and strategies for dealing with bullying may
be further developed.

Theoretical Perspectives

During the last decade, bullying of and by children of all ages has become a prominent
social, educational, legal and media issue, worldwide (Tattum & Tattum, 1992; Olweus,
1993; Rigby, 1999). This is not least the case because bullying can have highly destructive
short and long term physical, social-relational, and educational consequences for students’
(Batsche & Knoff, 1994; Cumming, 1998; Farrington 1993; Griffiths, 1996; Rigby, 2000;
Smith & Sharp, 1994).

Students’ Experiences of Bullying in Schools

Students’ experiences of bullying may vary across three key dimensions: frequency of bullying,
type of bullying, and location of bullying. With respect to these key dimensions there is:

(a) little consistency in the literature concerning estimates of the overall frequency of
bullying experienced by students (see, for example, Maxwell & Carroll-Lind, 1997;
Mellor, 1990; and Rigby, 1996 for evidence of some substantially diverging
estimates).

(b) some agreement concerning the types of bullying most commonly experienced by
students, with teasing, rumour-mongering, social exclusion, threats, and actual
physical bullying being commonly experienced types of bullying across a range of

(c) some agreement as to the locations in which bullying is likely to be experienced, with school playgrounds, toilets and corridors, and certain out-of-school locations (eg. bus stops) being common locations for bullying experiences (Melor, 1990; Slee, 1995).

Covariates of Bullying

In addition to the above, there is some data in the literature concerning the covariates of bullying. These include individual factors such as age, sex and cultural background, and school factors such as school type and school climate. With respect to these variables it appears that:

(a) bullying (particularly physical bullying) increases though the elementary school years, peaks in the early years of high school, and declines during the later years of high school (Banks, 1997; Rigby & Slee, 1995).

(b) at all ages, boys engage in physical bullying more than girls (Banks, 1997; Froschel & Gropper, 1999; Rigby & Slee, 1995). However, there is some evidence that girls are bullied at least as much as boys when non-physical forms of bullying are taken into account (Brouwer, 1998).

(c) the effect of cultural background (particularly when manifest in physical appearance) on the incidence of bullying in schools has not been well investigated. However, at least one study (Olweus, 1993) has shown that some students reported being bullied
because of a culturally-based social or physical characteristics such as their religious practices, dress, or overall physical appearance.

School factors which may influence students experiences and perceptions of bullying include the type of school (eg. single sex or co-educational, state run or private) and the perceived climate of the school (ie. 'warm' or 'cold', 'supportive' or 'not supportive'). With respect to these factors:

(d) there is little consensus in the literature concerning the effect(s) of school type on students' bullying experiences (Banks, 1997; Martin, 1993; Rigby, 1996).

(e) there has been very little research into the effect of school climate on students experiences and perceptions of bullying (but see Rigby, 2000 for one exception).

Method

Participants

The participants in the present study were 1403 students in Years 7 (first year of high-school) to 12 (last year of high school) attending two secondary schools in Sydney, NSW, Australia. The first school was a co-educational state high school (n = 623: 256 females, 367 males). The second was a non-systemic Catholic girls’ school (n = 780). The students were roughly equally distributed across each school year (7-12). Most students (approx. 60%) were from Anglo-Australian backgrounds, with the reminder being from non-Anglo (particularly Asian and Middle-Eastern) backgrounds.
Measures

All participants completed the School Safety Survey (SSS). This instrument was designed to ascertain students' experiences of, perceptions of, and attitudes towards bullying in school contexts. (A copy of the instrument will be provided in the Appendix of the presented paper.) Specifically, students' experiences of bullying were measured by a set of questions that asked them to nominate:

(a) the particular kinds of bullying behaviour(s) they had experienced (e.g. being teased, punched, left-out, etc.),

(b) the frequency with which they had experienced this bullying (on a five point scale ranging from “never” to “daily”), and

(c) the location(s) where, they had experienced bullying (e.g. toilets, playground, bus stop, etc.)

Students' perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying in school were measured by several questions which asked students, for example, whether they thought bullying was a problem in their school, whether they would report incidents of bullying to teachers, and whether they would help victims of bullying. School climate was measured by a question that asked whether the “school helped students to feel good about themselves”.

Analyses

Descriptive statics were used to quantify students experiences of, perceptions of, and attitudes towards bullying. Inferential statistics (particularly Multivariate Analysis of Variance - MANOVA) were used to determine the effect of age, sex, cultural background,
school type, and school climate on students experiences of, perceptions of, and attitudes towards bullying.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

A summary of the main descriptive results of the study is recorded below.

(a) Frequency of Bullying. 241 (17.2%) of all students reported being bullied at least once each week. The remaining 82.8% of students reported never, or hardly ever, experiencing the listed forms of bullying.

(b) Types of Bullying. The most commonly reported types of bullying were teasing, being left out, and being hit or kicked.

(c) Attitudes Towards, and Perceptions of, Bullying.

(i) 36.9% of students reported that bullying was “not a problem” at their school, whilst 16.5% reported that bullying was “definitely a problem at their school”.

(j) 80.4% of all students reported that they would be willing to help someone they saw being bullied. 66.1% said they would be prepared to report incidents of bullying to teachers.

(ii) approximately half of the participants reported feeling unsafe on school busses (n = 795, 56.7%), when walking to school (n = 720, 51.3%), and in school toilets (n = 698, 49.8%).
Inferential Statistics

A summary of the main inferential results reported in the study is recorded below.

(d) The effect of individual factors (i.e. gender, age and cultural background) on students' experiences of bullying was examined in a first MANOVA. No interaction effects were significant. However, there was a main effect for gender ($F = 2.23$, df= 7, sig. $F = .029$) on students' experiences of bullying. Somewhat surprisingly, follow-up one-way ANOVAs indicated that females reported being teased, threatened and hit significantly more than the males in the study, and that males reported that they were left out significantly more that did the females in the study. The main effects of age and cultural background on students' experiences of bullying were not significant.

(e) A second MANOVA examined the effects of individual factors (gender, age and culture) on students' perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying.

(i) There was a significant multivariate three-way interaction (gender x age x culture) on students' perceptions and attitudes towards bullying ($F = 1.75$, df = 45, sig. $F = .002$). There were also significant two-way interaction effects for gender x age ($F = 2.80$, df = 25, sig. $F = .000$), and age x cultural background ($F = 1.47$, df = 50, p = .017).

(ii) In each of these interactions, the effect was significant with respect to the perception that family background was associated with bullying experiences. Specifically, older students (notwithstanding their gender), and students with two parents born overseas in non-English
speaking countries (notwithstanding their age), were more likely to report that bullying was associated with their (or other similar students’) family backgrounds. Older students (notwithstanding their gender) also reported significantly more that bullying was a problem at their school.

(f) The third MANOVA examined the effect of school factors (i.e. school type and school climate) on students’ experiences of bullying. There was a significant two-way multivariate interaction effect (school type x school climate) on students’ experiences of bullying (F= 1.74, df = 21, p = .018). Univariate analyses indicated that students who reported that their school climate was poor, particularly students in the single-sex (girls) school, were more likely to report being bullied (particularly by being left-out of things on purpose (F= 3.35, p= .019), being forced to give money or belongings to someone (F= 2.97, p=.031), and being touched in ways that were unwelcome (F= 8.58, p=.000).

(g) The fourth MANOVA examined the effect of school factors (school type and school climate) on students’ perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying.

(i) There was no significant multivariate interaction effect (school type x school climate) on students’ perceptions of bullying (F= 1.34, df = 15, p = .166).

(ii) There was a significant main effect for school type on perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying (F = 3.87, df =5, p = .002). Specifically, students at the single sex girls school were more likely
to report family background as a cause of bullying (F = 6.07, p = .014), that bullying was a problem (F = 8.56, p = .003), and that they would be willing to help victims of bullying (F = 4.25, p = .039).

(iii) There was also a significant main effect of school climate on students’ perceptions of and attitudes towards bullying (F = 8.20, df = 15, p = .000). Univariate analyses indicated that the more supportive a student perceived the school climate to be, the less the student felt that family background and physical appearance contributed to bullying, and the less of a problem in general they perceived bullying to be in their school. Interestingly, ‘supported’ students also reported being less likely to report problems with bullying, or to help someone being bullied.

Summary of Results

Overall, the results of the study indicate that:

(a) gender (but not age or cultural background taken individually) was associated with students’ experiences of bullying i.e. females and males reported different experiences of bullying, and

(b) age and culture (but not gender taken individually) were associated with students’ perceptions of, and attitudes towards, bullying.

(c) school type and climate interacted to effect students’ experiences of bullying.

However, these variables did not interact to effect students’ perceptions of
bullying. These findings suggest that school type (notwithstanding variations in perceptions of school climate) influences experiences of bullying; whereas both school climate and school type influence perceptions of bullying.

Taken together the results summarised above appear to indicate that gender and school type are the most salient influences on experiences of bullying, whereas age, cultural background, school type and school climate are the most salient influences on perceptions of bullying.

**Importance of the Study**

The present study is important because it details (a) the results of a large scale, systematic investigation of adolescents’ experiences of, perceptions of, and attitudes towards bullying, and (b) individual and school factors associated with those experiences, perceptions, and attitudes.

Bullying studies to date have primarily investigated students’ experiences of bullying. Fewer studies have investigated students’ perceptions of, and attitudes towards bullying. Fewer still (in fact, we are aware of no other studies extant in the literature) have investigated the range of individual and school factors which may be associated with both students’ experiences and perceptions of bullying. For these reasons, the present study makes an important contribution to the research literature, and may contribute to a more accountable basis upon which policy decisions concerning bullying may be made.
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STAFF DEVELOPMENT LEAVE PROGRAM OF VISITS 1995
SELECTION OF PROGRAMS AND ORGANISATIONS ACCESSED,
PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS
U.S.A., CANADA, U.K.
DATE OF VISIT : 1st March, 1995

CONTACT : Dr Mike Furlong
          Dr Gail Morrison

ACTIVITIES : Meeting to discuss violence intervention and policy interface in Australia and Australia and California

This meeting came about following correspondence between Dr Furlong and myself after we both published in the Pepperdine University National School Safety Centre Journal and recognised a close alignment of philosophical and pragmatic issues. Dr Furlong is one of few professionals involved in anti-violence programming who is conducting evaluative research gathering empirical data on the impact and outcomes of such programs. His emphasis on a ‘whole school approach’ and my own work on a ‘comprehensive approach’ reinforce a commitment to long term and systematic intervention. He and his colleague, Dr Gail Morrison, are enthusiastic practitioners with young people as well as collaborating on research. They are currently examining the Resolve Curriculum I left with them to receive constructive feedback.
Planning for
Safe, Secure, Peaceful Schools

Charles Weis, Ph.D.
Ventura County Superintendent of Schools

in partnership with

Jules Zimmer, Ph.D.
Dean, Graduate School of Education, UCSB

• 1993-1994 •

How to Start
Working Collaboratively
Creating a Vision
Collecting Data
Determining Needs
Selecting Actions
Writing the Plan
Ensuring Success

• For Assistance •

L. Morrison, Ed.D.
(652-7337)

Michael J. Furlong, Ph.D.
Graduate School of Education
(805) 893-3333
DATE OF VISIT : 2nd March, 1995

CONTACT : Tony Ostos - Neighbourhood Counselling Manager

ACTIVITIES : - Visit school and observe Paramount Plan Program being taught.
- Meeting with Paramount City Office discussing programs.

This was a very rewarding visit enabling me to enter a primary level classroom, discuss gang-related issues with students and staff; observe the curriculum being taught and meet juvenile gang members. I was also able to discuss the relevance of the program to our school curriculum and share the Resolve Curriculum to obtain feedback.

Los Cerritos Elementary School is in east L.A. and is one of the most depressed areas of the city. The large Hispanic origin population is fully immersed in the gang culture and the existence of gangs and their impact on the lives of these children is very apparent. Every child in this classroom raised their hand when asked if they had ever lost a family member as a result of gang conflict. The Paramount Plan is to intervene before gang membership is entrenched and the approach used is curricular intervention, family counselling and youth support. Initial research indicates at a 12 month follow-up that 98% of the participants who engaged in the program stated that they were not involved in gang activity as a direct result of participation in the program. The two boys pictured were involved in continued counselling with the service as they had established links with drug-dealing gangs.

A meeting with the counselling staff was equally informative and interacting. The materials were well developed, supporting resources effective (including McGruff, the gangbusting bloodhound!) and the staff eager to share and disseminate their expertise. A very pragmatic meeting.

The Paramount Plan gang intervention curriculum will be reserved and adapted for trial in Australian schools as a precautionary measure, since gang membership is not a major problem at this point. The introduction of some preventative materials will contribute to the comprehensive management and rejection of gang membership.

STAY OUT OF GANs

[Image of a logo with text: STAY OUT OF GANs]
DATE OF VISIT : 10th & 13th March, 1995

CONTACT : Larry Cohen - Director
           Nancy Guerra - Executive
           Dr Tom Novotant (former Surgeon General)

ACTIVITIES : • State Violence Prevention Team Meeting
             • Overview of Resources & Programs
             • Meeting with Teens-On-Target Director, Andres Soto
             • Lunch with Larry Cohen
             • University of California - Berkeley - Masters Class presented by Larry Cohen with special guests.

The visit was one of the highlights of the itinerary - the Contra Costa County (local government) Prevention Program represented an innovative approach to interventive in particular with their "coalition approach". In June, 1994 I had organised such a coalition meeting at UWS, involving education, community groups, unions, health, legal and government representatives coming to share what they were developing in the area of violence prevention or intervention programs. The Contra Costa group had developed this intensively and were very forthcoming with advice and information regarding their interventions. The meetings took place during torrential rain storms but enthusiasm was never dampened.

On the following Monday I met with Larry Cohen who directs the program and also lectures at University of California (Berkeley). We walked through the rain soaked grounds of the University to Dwinelle House where I met the Masters class (Health Administration) undertaking the subject "Violence as a Community Health Issue". Following some discussion, a group of special guests arrived, the members of the anti-gang program "teens on Target". Their leader "Sherman" as in a wheel chair permanently as a result of a gang-inflicted wound - he had a powerful message regarding gay activity. A physician who had tended to many gang related wounds and murders to describe the intervention he felt would address the violence issue. Dr Tom Norotomy (former Surgeon General for California State) was also present as member of the teaching team - he placed gay activity alongside smoking as the key health issues in USA today. Overall, a very stimulating couple of days.
PREVENTION PROGRAM

SCHEDULE
MARCH 10 - 13, 1995

A Warm Welcome to Jean Jenkin from the Contra Costa County Public Health Prevention Program! Jean is visiting with us from the University of Western Sydney, Australia.

I. CHECK IN - FRIDAY, MARCH 10

II. SCHEDULE:
- 9 - 10am    COFFEE & DISCUSSION
- 10 - 12am   FAMILY MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION (FMO) MEETING
- 12 - 1:30pm LUNCH - PROGRAM OVERVIEW & DISCUSSION (open to staff)
- 1:30 - 2:15pm CONSULTATION WITH ANDRES
- 2:15pm      TRAVEL TO WEST COUNTY
- 3 - 5pm     OPPORTUNITY WEST - OCJP PLANNING
- 5 - 5:30pm  DEBRIEF WITH NANCY

III. CHECK IN - MONDAY, MARCH 13

- LUNCH WITH LARRY COHEN, CONSULTING DIRECTOR
- 2:40pm UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, AT BERKELEY
  VIOLENCE PREVENTION PUBLIC HEALTH CLASS - LARRY

Please Note: At the Luncheon, we would like to have equal representation so that Jean can get an overview of what we do.
DATE OF VISIT : 29-31st March, 1995

CONTACT : Renea McCummings
           Kathy Beland

Whilst in Seattle I called into The Committee for Children office to purchase the 2nd Step curriculum (Youth Violence Prevention). The training offered by this organization is presented in many cities so I was able to arrange to complete the 3-day course whilst in Boston. The participants came from a range of educational and community organizations all concerned with violence intervention. This comprehensive programme of materials for grades K-12 covers a broad range of relevant issues and behaviours identified elsewhere as key components in violence intervention: - empathy training, anger management, impulse control etc., for individuals. The teaching also covered administration and training considerations, research and evaluation in effectiveness and encouraged team-building and networking. The curriculum, though American in content and presentation, has many relevant components and is available to Australian institutions who can now access training through me.
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

Jean Jenkins

has completed Trainer Training in the

PREVENTION OF YOUTH VIOLENCE

March 29-31, 1995

COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN

trains individuals to implement Second Step in their schools and communities.

Renee McCummings
Trainer

COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN
DATE OF VISIT : 15th & 16th March, 1995

CONTACT : Dr Jerry Patterson
Dr Kate Kavanagh
Dr Tom Dishion

ACTIVITIES : See itinerary

This was very intensive couple of days with a group of extremely experienced, internationally acknowledged researchers. I was both anxious and eager at the thoughts of meeting and discussing issues with them. Their focus is empirical and quantitative, although they offer long-term individual interventions for young people with serious social (behavioural problems including violence, gang activity and delinquency. The Centre is an offshoot of the University of Oregon where researchers such as Dr Hili M Walker maintain close contact and collaboration. I was able to participate by presenting my Resolve I curriculum and receiving critical feedback on the attitude measure included. I was also able to observe a ‘bull session’ where a team member presented her research findings and received feedback. The team also made available to me a series of parent training materials which focused on social skills training. I purchased a large bundle of recent papers prior to departing for Canada.
**Jean B. Jenkin**  
Lecturer, Special Education  
University of Western Sydney - Macarthur  
Campbelltown, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 15 - Wednesday</th>
<th></th>
<th>March 16 - Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Carleen Reilly</td>
<td>Tour of OSLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Jerry Patterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 3:00 ??</td>
<td>Presentation of ResolVE I</td>
<td>LO Area of North Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 16 - Thursday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30</td>
<td>Becky Ectrow</td>
<td>Introduction to PIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:30</td>
<td>Mark Eddy</td>
<td>PIRC Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00</td>
<td>Bull Session</td>
<td>LO Area of North Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 2:45</td>
<td>Patti Chamberlain</td>
<td>Overview of Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foster Care Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING TO DISCUSS HARVARD NEGOTIATION PROGRAM

DATE OF VISIT : 30th March, 1995 - 2.00 - 4.00 p.m.

CONTACT : Mr Drew Tulcomello
Associate Professor
Harvard Law School

I took the subway to Harvard University and walked around in the pouring rain until I found a very youthful Drew with a broken leg. We met to discuss the Harvard Law School Negotiation Project in which students are trained to develop high level negotiation skills such as those used in arms and trade deals between countries. Young people in high school are trained to use the same skills in local and interpersonal negotiations for day to day contracts in borrowing, friendships, and support. His research interest is empathy training and agreed to remain in contact re: readings and research into empathy training.
YOU CAN WORK IT OUT

If you’re a high school student, you negotiate all the time. Asking your boss for a raise; talking with your parents about how late you’re allowed to stay out; discussing with a boyfriend or girlfriend the boundaries of your relationship. All these situations involve communication between you and another person, and all involve negotiation.

But negotiations don’t always go the way we hope they will. We don’t always listen to each other, and we don’t always understand how the other person sees things or what it is they really want. It’s common after negotiating to feel like things haven’t improved very much. In fact, sometimes things seem like they’ve actually gotten worse.

But we can do better than this. Based on principles of negotiation developed at the Harvard Negotiation Project, Working It Out will help you to:

* understand how the other side sees things;
* focus on underlying interests, not on demands;
* invent new options for solving problems; and
* reach agreements based on what’s fair.

If you follow these principles, you’ll feel more confident when you deal with others, and reach agreements that are good for everyone.

WORKING IT OUT
A Handbook on Negotiation for High School Students
Draft November 27, 1990

Roger Fisher and Douglas Stone
The Harvard Negotiation Project

500 Pound Hall
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-1684

Copyright © 1990 by Roger Fisher and Douglas Stone. All Rights Reserved.
DATE OF VISIT : 4th April, 1995  9.00 - 12.30 p.m.

CONTACT : Dr. Joel Straussner
          District Superintendent, School Counsellors

Dr. Straussner had contacted me from New York after reading an article I had written to the School Safety Journal, California. We were able to arrange to include a visit to his district in New York, to attend a monthly counsellors meeting. Dr. Straussner was eager to see the Resolve Curriculum presented as well as the comprehensive approach to violence intervention. The assembled counsellors represented 45 local high schools with varying levels of violence and gang membership, drug and alcohol abuse amongst their populations. They described their unique problems and were eager to hear of the way in which Australian education is organized and how the Resolve curriculum could be incorporated into their programs. They were surprised at the low levels of gang involvement and violent incidents in Australian schools and put forward compelling arguments to explain why the New York District population of high school students were inclined to engage in violence. The Bronx district and Harlem in particular were difficult locations within their boundaries and it was clear that the levels of violence within schools represented a high stress factor. Several volunteered to swap with counsellors in Australia! A wonderful lunch in a Manhattan deli followed this meeting - and a ride in the N.Y. subway. I survived it all!
DATE OF VISIT : 20th April, 1995  10.00 - 4.00 p.m.

CONTACT : Dr. Brendon Byrne  
University College Dublin  
Ms Alison Soutter  
Luton University, U.K.

I had arranged to meet these researchers through Dr. Ken Rigby from University of S.A. - a leading Australian researcher in bullying. We met at University college but proceeded to Dr. Byrne's home for our meeting. Here we discussed his publications (Bullying - a Community Approach;) and current research and practice in Ireland. Ms. Soutter (an ex-patriot Australian) also discussed her research on racial harassment with particular reference to the area north of London where her university was located. Frequent racial riots and sexual and racial harassment of students disrupted campus routines and led to high security measures. I was able to review the Resolve curriculum with them and make plans for future visits to Australia.
DATE OF VISIT : 24th April, 1995

CONTACT : Mr. Andrew Mellor
Consultant S.R.E.O.
Bullying in Schools

Andrew Mellor presented at the Peer Relations Conference in Adelaide in 1994 and I contacted him to seek an opportunity to review his initiatives while he was a consultant in Edinburgh. I travelled from the far S.W. corner of Scotland (Straurar) to Edinburgh to meet with him in his office, as arranged. Unfortunately he had since transferred back to his school the previous week and had been unable to contact me. His school was located in St. Johns Town Dalmy - 15 miles from Straurar so I had to travel back again to meet up with him. We discussed his work as a seconded consultant to the Edinburgh based SREO and how he could continue to contribute during his employment at a local Scottish high school. It seemed a sad loss of ability and knowledge to have been placed in a classroom when his expertise was needed to develop anti-bullying initiatives further throughout Scotland. Nevertheless he seemed perfectly happy with a cosy cottage across the street from the high school - and less responsibility as well as less recognition.
I had been invited by Alison to present to her students some aspects of my recent travels and anti-violence initiatives particularly. The group of 3rd year students looked remarkably similar to my own students! They asked lots of questions and probed for information on prevention and intervention programs of which I had many to share with them! Alison is living in U.K. due to her husbands work placement but plans to return to Australia in 1996 to look for employment possibly in UWS. Her research in bullying is mainly based on university experiences but is expanding to look at in school bullying of teachers. We agreed to meet in Sydney when she returned.
SEE PORTFOLIO VOLUME 4

JENKIN J. (1997) BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL: A MANUAL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION
Includes training in-service presentation for whole school education regarding bullying
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STRUCTURING A POLICY FOR A NON-VIOLENT SCHOOL

JEAN B. JENKIN

ABSTRACT

The perception in the media currently seems to be that gratuitous violence in schools is on the rise and that students and staff are more at risk today than ever before, of being physically or verbally assaulted while at school. The validity of this perception is being explored, but a case does not have to be proven before the need for a policy is accepted. Schools are expressing an interest in developing specific structures to reduce the possibility of increased violence and aggression. Both here and overseas systematic responses to anticipated violence are being developed in an effort to establish safe non-violent schools. (Nightingale and Mortimer 1992; Jenkin & Bowie 1992).
STRUCTURING A POLICY FOR A NON-VIOLENT SCHOOL

JEAN B. JENKIN

RATIONALE

Designing a policy for a non-violent school reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members, in that they are making a conscious decision to manage their environment in a positive way. It reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale and illustrates a philosophical commitment to equity by addressing the unequal power relationships between participants. If it specifies procedures, responsibilities and resources, it will facilitate the maintenance of the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of all parties. The policy should be designed to define relationships, acknowledge individual differences in ability, personal style and goals, and should state the training and support mechanisms which will ensure that all concerned have their legitimate needs met. While such a policy statement will clarify responsive procedures, the major thrust should be to record a practical and philosophical statement in relation to maintaining a safe and nurturing environment through the development of preventative attitudes, skills and knowledge.
In structuring the policy, the following key components should be considered:

A. Philosophical Statement
B. Personnel, Student & Community Considerations
C. Programmes, strategies and skills
D. Processes for Implementation
E. Resources

A. PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENT

Schools are now adept at recording statements related to their mission or purpose, but after the initial glow of success when the statement is produced in a glossy format, such statements may well be shelved and forgotten. The key to an effective philosophical statement is that it be brief, coherent, comprehensive and accessible. The statement should belong to the school community and reflect a genuine belief in what they expect they can achieve in the management of violence. It should therefore be composed following input from staff, students and the community. It should be consistently visible and frequently reinforced. Even primary aged children can understand fairness, safety and rights if the concepts are delivered in understandable phraseology.
The philosophical statement is not the time to state rules and warn of dire consequences. It records how the school thinks and feels about violence prevention and illustrates a commitment to maintaining a safe and secure environment for all. Stated positively it should refer to such elements as:

i) school being a safe place for students and for staff. This of course includes offenders and prospective offenders. Abusive and emotionally or physically damaging behaviour should be equally rejected in adult personnel and students. This is a key consideration in a school milieu where relatively few constraints exist for monitoring teacher and student interpersonal interactions. Gilles (1973) suggests that violence against children is condoned as it is seen as the parent or teacher's duty and it is for the "child's own good", and the failure to eradicate corporal punishment supports this belief (Wallace 1986). Schools will not become safe places for students or teachers until society withdraws the right for adults to use physical punishment as part of a professional relationship;

ii) school being a non-violent place. It needs to be said, and it needs to be confirmed, that violent behaviour by any member of the school community will not be tolerated. Students will know when the philosophical statement refers to them but not to parents, teachers,
ground staff or other adults at the school who may exhibit violent or aggressive behaviours.

iii) Incorporating this notion in the policy can be somewhat difficult if individuals are not clear on this point but adults in the school community must be seen to model the appropriate behaviours (Smith & Barajas, 1988) A categorical statement about which behaviours will be expected and which will not be accepted should be included. Such behaviours as verbal abuse (name-calling, swearing, shouting and sarcasm) and physical abuse (pushing, striking, throwing objects etc) should be clearly identified and listed as inappropriate.

iii) the school recognizing identifying and listing legal, moral and psychological rights of the members of the school community; an accompanying schedule of such rights could be produced for display

iv) The statement should delineate the school community view on responsibilities of members to sustain a non violent environment; this schedule could also be produced as a poster for display or inclusion in student books, teacher programmes etc.

The philosophical statement should also indicate that training and support will be available for those members of the school community whose behaviour indicates that their personal philosophy of violence differs substantially from the communal view and the statement should be in terms which identify measurable or specific behaviours to be demonstrated in the quest for a non violent school. The macro-system
response to the problem of violence in schools, however, must
incorporate the development of a national code of ethics for teachers.
This notion would clearly delineate for the community the exact
parameters of teacher professional responsibility. It should therefore
clarify those areas of students' socialization and education which are
fundamentally a community or family responsibility. Stated positively,
the code of ethics would, as with any such document, provide reference
points by which to measure professional integrity. It would also act as a
framework for protection of teachers just as similar codes offer other
professions. The development of such a code of ethics for teachers is
currently being explored (Jenkin 1993).

B. PERSONNEL, STUDENT AND COMMUNITY
CONSIDERATIONS

The policy needs to clearly acknowledge the persons involved in the
development of this non-violent culture. To this end the following need
to be considered:

i) Teaching and Support Staff

The recruitment of staff whose philosophical views specifically
reflect cohesion with the school philosophy. Indeed active recruitment
of such personnel, rather than acceptance of less appropriate though
available staff, should be undertaken.
In particular, schools for specific purposes such as community care placements for juvenile offenders, support facilities for disability groups may need to identify specific prerequisites and seek evidence that the candidate possesses them. This may involve certain industrial considerations, but needs to be explored if maintenance of the policy is to be insured. An interview procedure may need to be conducted by a representative group within the school community and external monitors to determine the level of expertise and response repertoire of candidates. At this time, some examination of the components of the pre-service training programme should be made to determine whether behaviour management principles have been substantially incorporated in the undergraduate course of study. At the very least the equivalent of a full semester unit of study would need to have been undertaken to provide a reasonable foundation for successful management. Unless clients identify the specific skills and knowledge they believe are necessary, pre-service courses will continue to represent an amalgamation of the individual judgements of academics as to the most appropriate content. In relation to this also is the notion that superimposing a range of "special education" designated skills - such as individualizing instruction, diagnostic teaching etc., will necessarily 'prepare' new teachers for the role they assume in classrooms. Pre-service teacher education must also
substantially address teacher attitudes and interpersonal skills if the professional skills are ever to be implemented.

Teachers whose attitudes reflect apprehension about or rejection of students, will be less likely to be successful than teachers whose preservice experiences have included some exposure to difficult students (Jenkin 1991).

**Induction/orientation programmes for staff.** Too often it is automatically assumed that staff appointed to schools will 'feel their way through' and absorb all of the philosophical nuances the school community has deliberately selected and adopted or simply developed. It is not fair to assume that the school community view is obvious or accessible and orientation/induction programmes can ensure that at least the foundation philosophy is available and understood. Such a programme could be delivered in a 'buddy' or 'mentor' partnership between established and new staff members. The development of **teams** to support colleagues and the opportunity for staff members to share their expertise and strategies with others, should be stated as a positive proposal in the policy for example a Grievance committee, Debriefing Team or Programme Co-ordinator Group could be established.

ii) **Students**
Providing for the identification of student academic, social and physical needs on an individual and group basis is fundamental to the structure of an effective policy.

This needs to be thoroughly explored as the evidence is overwhelming that students with learning, social, emotional and often physical impairments are the ones most likely to be victims or perpetrators of violence or aggression in schools. (Lane 1989; Olweus 1983; Prothow-Stith 1987; Goldstein & Huff 1993; Long 1989; Askew 1989; Rose 1988). These students are more likely to be suspended for such incidents and to become recidivist and a significant number develop serious behavioural problems leading to incarceration. (Slee 1988, Bain 1988; Jenkin 1989). The students' academic social and behavioural skills need to be assessed and some individualization of programmes provided for in the policy.

Clarification of the means through which students may be included in policy development and implementation procedures should be identified. Formulation of a student representative council and membership privileges on the school anti-violence committee or representative body should also be specified. An "inclusive" approach is more likely to yield positive results in terms of commitment to the policy.
iii) Parents

The policy should clarify the level and type of contact to be established which will empower parents to contribute to the development of a "non-violent school" policy.

Inclusion of parents in training and support programmes for children at the school is essential; and the provision of relevant programmes for parents also needs clarification. The issue of parental responsibility for the management of their child's behaviour needs to be discussed - including retribution/supervision/cooperation with school policy and behaviour management skillling. The policy needs to state what roles and responsibilities the school and parents share and which are separate. Supervision before and after school should be clarified particularly with regard to children living at some distance from the school. The abrogation of such responsibility is paramount if out-of-school and out-of-home time periods are to be appropriately spent.

Provisions should be stated for consultation on an individual basis with parents of children (i) whose behaviour reflects a lack of compliance with the policy or (ii) whose children complain of being victims.
The role of "visits" and other parental privileges in specific settings can also be clarified in this part of the policy.

iv) Other Personnel

Multi disciplinary and cross disciplinary considerations need to be identified. The composition of a consultative team including the school counsellor, school executive, teaching and other staff would be described here. In addition, outside agencies offering support programmes for students (such as the Macarthur Suspension Support Programme, Jenkin, 1989, see Appendix for details) should have personnel listed as consultants or mentors in this part of the policy. Community involvements outside educational institutions, including church, business and volunteer organizations should be sought and incorporated into the policy.

Finally, the policy needs to include an acknowledgement and celebration of difference in the persons involved. Increasingly in the human services literature the impact of different personality orientations is identified. With this in mind, introspective and exploratory workshops may need to be made available so that all parties can familiarize themselves with their own response patterns and those of others with
whom they engage. It is important that the policy states that diversity in approach can be acceptable when results indicate that outcomes are consistent.

"Consistency" should not mean that the same strategies and styles are prescribed for all personnel, but rather that, using one's own strategies and style, results can be consistently positive. Goldstein (1989) has also described the various psychological and personality needs of individual students, each of whom responds differently to specific strategies for management of their destructive or aggressive behaviour. Diversity in nature is accepted, diversity in approach must be endorsed if a school is to effectively deal with a range of individual characteristics.

C. PROGRAMMES, STRATEGIES AND SKILLS

Having determined that a range of approaches is necessary because of individual needs and orientations of teachers, students and others, the programmes section should identify major programme types:

i. Curricular programmes

ii. Preventative programmes and strategies

iii. Responsive programmes and strategies
iv. Administrative considerations.

as well as strategies available and skills necessary for all participants
to develop a non-violent attitude.

i) CURRICULAR PROGRAMMES

Obviously curriculum guidelines for delivery of content, basic
competencies and skills in the key learning areas should be followed.

However, if violence and aggression are evident as problems in the
school environment, teachers may need to reconsider the emphasis of
their curriculum planning. In such a setting, a shift towards behavioural
and social skills programmes as the major components of their teaching
may need to be considered. If children have difficulty relating to each
other and to staff then it seems unlikely they will satisfactorily complete
academic assignments anyway. A key to the success of programmes in
support units for emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children in
Western Sydney, was recognition of this fact. (Jenkin, 1988). Academic
programmes were systemized and individualized comprehensively so
that work was always presented at either the independent or
instructional level. This left teachers free to incorporate social skills and
behaviour skills programmes into every activity and interaction entered
into during academic learning time. In addition, specific lessons which
related to social skills development and behaviour skills for interpersonal interactions were presented daily.

School personnel need to re-think and to state in the policy for a non-violent school, that the immediate emphasis for their teaching of particular students may not always be academic content and skills, and the necessity for this should be endorsed by the administration or executive. Teachers who need to manage difficult students' behaviour, should not be made to feel guilty because academic activities are given a reduced priority in some circumstances. This philosophy, included in the policy, supports teachers' attempts to teach the whole child, but at the same time has, as a foundation, acceptance of the notion that all three aspects of the child's needs are the responsibility of educators. Teachers need not necessarily deliver all three programme components alone - collaboration with support teachers and counsellors may be sought.

Curricular programmes should be listed in the document:

Academic. The policy should state that academic programmes will be based on department of school education guidelines but will reflect individual student needs and competencies, will be criterion referenced, systematically recorded and evaluated. Individualization of classroom programmes is a key skill for teachers to acquire.
Social skills. A structured social skills programme such as the Hill Walker Series (e.g. ACCEPTS) as well as incidental, though monitored social skills management should be identified.

Behaviour. Specific behaviour programmes such as Aggression Response Training (Goldstein) Violence Prevention (Prothrow-Stith), Talk Sense to Yourself (Wragg) as well as strategies devised by staff to manage aggressive behaviour in a positive, firm and effective manner, can be listed here.

ii) PREVENTATIVE PROGRAMMES

If the policy is to comprehensively deal with all aspects of violence prevention, it needs to identify personal, interpersonal, professional and administrative strategies for management. Goldstein & Glick (1988) identified 157 various approaches to violence prevention in U.S. schools, ranging from arming teachers to parental patrols and Federal legislation. While this range of preventative measures is not required or desired by Australian schools, a more creative and effective range does need to be compiled.

Students need to be prepared and supported in developing individual strategies for preventing their victimization at school. The two major groups identified as likely to be involved in incidents seem to
be a physically weak and emotionally insecure group of children who are generally on the receiving end of the violence perpetrated, and a socially/emotionally deprived or neglected group of children who perpetrate the violence against other children to bolster their self-esteem (Olweus (1987); Lane (1989); Askew (1989).

This does not take account of the partnerships between potentially aggressive adults in the school environment and vulnerable children, nor does it distinguish the teacher who is a victim of individual or group student violence perpetrated against her. Clearly each member of this equation needs an individualized programme to prevent the ongoing negative relationship.

a) **Children And Youth**

Children need to establish and maintain personal strengths as a means of dealing with aggression directed towards them, or selecting more appropriate behaviour when the temptation to use violence arises. This is obviously a long term goal. Goldstein (1989) and Lane (1989) describe the personality characteristics of individual students as 'fitting' them for one role or the other. There seems to be a reciprocal need satisfaction established as violent/aggressive children get what they want and the recipients gain peace temporarily by surrendering. The vast literature presently accumulating on school bullying supports this.
Programmes which address these populations need to be identified, examined and those deemed most appropriate, recorded in the school policy.

All children, for example, should be given the opportunity to develop appropriate social communication skills, play skills and multiple dimensions of self esteem. The SDQI (Self Description Questionnaire devised by Marsh (1989) is an accurate and relevant tool for identifying self selected low-esteem areas, which teachers can then target. In addition, moral development, empathy training, anger control, conflict resolution and cognitive restructuring approaches abound and can be selectively included to ensure that the skills students are required to demonstrate are actually within their behavioural repertoire.

b) Teachers And Other Staff

One of the key issues in management of aggression and violence by professions is, increasingly, the preferred style, personality type, teaching and learning methodologies selected. Systematic and credible measurements of variations in these should be utilized to help adults in the potentially violent situation create a descriptive portfolio of their own characteristics. Such introspection can prove cathartic, but if
considered realistically can contribute to a new understanding of others whose styles differ substantially from one's own.

In addition, it is essential that teachers engage in relevant in-service activities which will provide background information, strategies and practice in order to prepare teachers and others with knowledge of the sources, causes and dynamics of aggression. (Bowie 1989). By increasing their knowledge base, the options for effective intervention also increase. 'The Coping with Violence' workshops (Jenkin & Bowie 1992) (see Appendix) address these issues and present strategies for interpersonal, physical and organizational intervention for violent behaviours.

In addition, stress management, communication and classroom management strategies need to be explored and recorded as options in the policy. The school should be able to guarantee that each staff member has documented knowledge and understanding of the basic principles of behaviour.

c) Parents
Schools are generally reluctant to commission parent-education activities which may involve staff in long hours of additional attendance. The importance of home-school liaison in establishing and maintaining appropriate behaviours, has been discussed by Christenson (1992), Ward & Gow (1982) and others and the generalization of behaviours successfully developed in school settings, to the less structured home setting is a problem which needs further exploration. Programmes presented at the school for in-service training for teachers could no doubt be made available to interested parents and community members, but specific programmes which establish a closely monitored link between home and school behavioural performance may need to be devised for the particular setting and child.

The Suspension Support Programme, (Jenkin 1992) (see Appendix) comprises three modules - the Pre-Suspension, In-School Suspension and Suspension Support module, the focus being children whose behaviours deviate sufficiently from that of others in the school to warrant suspension. The strategy involves close home-school liaison and parent participation and may be included in the 'preventative' category if implemented to ensure the child remains in mainstream. It should be noted that the professional and personal skills of parents should be accessed wherever possible, as a rich resource of information,
and skill can remain untapped if the school does not appear to have an 'open door' policy.

iii) RESPONSE PROGRAMMES

The policy document needs to identify programmes to be mobilized in the event of an incident or series of incidents within the school. This may be the time in the policy statement to delineate categorically the parameters of school responsibility. Media reports which refer to "schoolboy" crimes often fail to clarify whether in fact the crime occurred within school hours, schools grounds or during school based supervision. Indeed, the reference to "school" in many reports merely reflects the child's age (which will obviously be 'school-age') and it is somewhat mischievous of the media to continue to insinuate that all criminal or violent acts perpetrated by children are in some way linked to "school". Therefore it would seem appropriate for schools to determine the extent of their supervisory responsibilities and to state these in the policy. For example, travel by public transport to and from school may not be viewed as requiring school supervision. 'Gang' conflicts outside school grounds; even between students of the school are probably
beyond the jurisdiction of school authority, and certainly acts of violence or criminal behaviour engaged in after school hours, even if students are still in school uniform, are probably the responsibility of the community, not the school.

Since a good deal of confusion seems to exist in this regard, it is important to record the school agreed parameters in the policy.

a) **Welfare and Discipline Policy Review**

This policy is compulsory for NSW schools and usually delineates the rewards, punishments and services available to maintain optimum support for students. The inclusion of this statement in the policy for a non violent school will clarify some potentially conflicting response strategies available to schools. If this policy for example states that corporal punishment (caning) of students is acceptable, some examination of the credibility of a policy for non-violence needs to be undertaken. We cannot demand that students remain unarmed if we approve 'arms' - however monitored - for teachers. There is a range of other intrusive management strategies which may need to be discussed in this section.

1. **Physical Responses**
The school can decide that in the event of a violent incident, specified forms of physical restraint, can be implemented.

To ensure a strategy is within the philosophical and practical constraints of a policy for non-violence, however, approved training for staff should be conducted. Such programmes as 'P.A.R.T.' (Professional Assault Response Training) developed by Dr. Paul Smith (1988) and "Evasive Self-Defence" devised by Vaughan Bowie (1989) are appropriate for this purpose. Department of School Education policy on the use of physical restraint will need to be incorporated into the policy or rejected as inappropriate by the school community. Many teachers are not comfortable with the concept of restraining violent students and alternative approaches should be sought in this case.

2. Timeout

The specific implementation procedures for use of timeout as a consequence should be clarified for inclusion in the policy for a non-violent school. Locked rooms, indefinite periods of time for isolation, physical force and verbal abuse are inconsistent with a policy for non-violence. The school may need to re-examine the specifics of this strategy as identified in the welfare and discipline policy, in order to
ensure an interface with the new policy. Timeout from reinforcement should be a relatively benign consequence of minor behavioural infractions. It should in no way resemble solitary confinement or incarceration.

3. Corporal Punishment

This strategy may be included in some school welfare and discipline policies after minimal consultation with parents, but the ramifications for violence within the school if such a strategy is consistently implemented are significant. It must be genuinely felt that the policy for non-violence applies to all members of the school community, and this particular strategy cannot be reconciled with such a policy.

4. Suspension, Expulsion, Exclusion

Schools generally feel the need to have access to procedures which relieve staff and other students temporarily from disruptive students. However, these periods of approved absence from school are usually not supervised, represent potentially reinforcing situations and often expose students to situations they have already indicated they cannot deal with. Specific recent incidents in NSW illustrate that such a strategy can also offer the opportunity for students to contemplate revenge and act on
such an idea. A policy for a non-violent school should probably identify a series of procedures which offer support to ensure that the ‘timeout’ from school period is effectively used to develop improved skills and attitudes. (Jenkin 1990).

b) **Grievance Procedure**

Just as any large organization has an agreed grievance procedure to empower members in discussing practices and behaviours which disturb, offend or threaten them, this policy should clarify the methodology and personnel available for registering a complaint concerning violence. It may be appropriate to create a joint staff/student committee to facilitate and moderate between school community members. However, access to external personnel should be an option if the parties cannot resolve the grievance and the policy needs to identify appropriate and acceptable individuals. Further it is essential that all members of the school community have equal access to the procedure. This is not to assume that having such access will necessarily empower members to use the process to protect their rights, but the school community needs to offer this commitment in the policy statement and make every attempt to encourage participation. Obviously, students, particularly in the primary years will need to be given skills and information to assist them to access such a procedure.
c) **Crisis Management Strategy**

A number of schools in NSW are currently implementing in-service programmes to equip staff with the necessary attitudes and skills to respond effectively in the event of major or minor crises within the school. While this general strategy will not just be mobilized for violent incidents the underlying principles represent a valuable contribution to the skills of teachers and students. For this reason its inclusion in the policy is recommended.

d) **Structured Debriefing** (Jenkin 1991) (See Appendix)

In order to ensure that incidents are thoroughly analysed and to avoid the depression they can often cause (Bowie 1988) a supportive structure needs to be put in place to facilitate the immediate debriefing of those involved. This particular strategy describes an approach involving colleagues in a structured procedure. However, an informal daily debriefing session should be incorporated into the timetable
particularly in specific settings where behavioural confrontations can be anticipated.

This will obviously require administrative support and possibly some re-organization of duties and responsibilities, perhaps on a rostered basis, but should nevertheless be identified in the policy statement.

iv) **ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS**

The policy needs to clarify the commitment of the administration elements of the school to the maintenance of a policy for non violence. This will involve commitment in the area of funding and organization specifically.

a) **funding or budget commitments** should reflect that monies needed to support programmes which effectively reduce violence, or which feasibly could do so, will be pledged annually and provided consistently. Further, the availability from outside services of funds should be researched and strategies for their acquisition put into place. A committee for the development of substantial submission for such funding could be initiated through the policy statement.
b) organizational flexibility is a key to successful management of violent or aggressive behaviour. The flexibility to select or change locations to suit specific management purposes is important for teachers who are developing strategies. This includes provision for timetabling, environmental and staff changes to be incorporated at short notice in response to incidents and in the longer term for flexibility of these elements as they relate to violence management.

D. PROCESSES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

In determining the processes for inclusion in the policy statement, the following needs to be considered:

i) organizational decisions

The roles and responsibilities of staff in relation to the policy should be defined to facilitate the process of implementation. In order to censure that the policy does not become 'shelved', a regular staff discussion of the document as it develops following construction, should be arranged. A regular segment at staff meetings, regular committee conventions and organization of input into 'documentation', would contribute to a dynamic policy.
ii) strategy selection - having determined that a range of strategies is available, access to these needs to be described, decisions made as to the preferred strategy for teachers own purposes and documentation of choice needs to be recorded.

Concern that a single strategy should be used throughout the school should be replaced on the understanding that the outcomes for all strategies used should be consistent i.e. children who are safe, non-violent, happy and making progress within individual classrooms. This should be stated in the policy.

iii) service delivery modes- the policy statement needs to support the notion of differentiation in delivery taking into account educational and administrative requirements as well as the individual preferences of teachers and staff. Some variations in delivery needs to be incorporated into programmes to ensure that students receive stimulation and achieve progress. Matching student preferred modes and teacher preferred modes in learning and teaching can only improve delivery and outcomes. Further, the availability of counselling, therapies and other support services needs to be identified in the policy. The right of the students to receive an effective training/education programme needs to be balanced with the right of the teacher to perform to maximum ability without impediment. Consideration of the needs of both parties should be clearly stated in the policy.
Inevitably, unless management encourages and supports the staff/student/community initiatives for violence prevention by adjusting traditional administrative arrangements, the logistics of implementation will lead to failure for the programmes and rejection of the policy. A degree of flexibility will need to be introduced in relation to class sizes and composition, timetables, staff distribution and duties, resources allocation etc. For example, an In-school Suspension programme, to be introduced effectively may require access to a room and furnishings, staff to operate the programme on a rotational basis, supervision to be increased etc. To authenticate the commitment of management to such violence prevention initiatives provision of those basic resources would need to be forthcoming.

iv) Evaluation/Review

A timetable for review of progress and for evaluation of effectiveness of programmes in reducing violence and aggression in the school should be included. Systematic recording of incidents, criteria for inclusion of incident in a report of violence and responses to the behaviour should be kept to determine effectiveness.

v) Documentation
Thorough recording of punitive measures taken in particular intensive behavioural and physical responses, (evasive self defence, time out, restraint etc,) should be maintained.

Individual records of teachers and students provide the support necessary for advocating changes to placement, programmes and staff involvement.

E. **RESOURCES**

   i) Human
   ii) Material
   iii) Administrative

A comprehensive list of the resources it can be anticipated will be available to support the policy should be included. This should represent a realistic appraisal of what is immediately available and what may be reasonably acquired, rather than a documentation of all possible resources. Indeed the resources section should be specifically designed to indicate acquisition or access plans for accumulating appropriate resources and these may be listed in a timeline or 1-2 year goal plan.

The structure of a policy for a non-violent school should be a comprehensive document which specifies particulars for implementation.
of programmes and strategies and inclusion of personnel and resources.

However, it should also be a reader-friendly, non-discriminatory and generally applicable policy in order that all members of the school community feel they have access to its contents.

It should represent a cohesive view illustrated through a collage of approaches, strategies and processes, all of which contribute to a realistic policy for the maintenance of a non-violent environment.

It is suggested that most school communities, having considered the contents of this paper, will be able to formulate a document for their own circumstances, which will reflect their commitment to a non violent school environment. It remains now for schools to undertake the task and move this goal from the purely academic to the vital practicality.
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APPENDIX

1. Macarthur Suspension Support Programme (Jenkin, J 1991)

   This programme has been offered as a suspension support initiative in the Metropolitan S.W. region of Sydney to provide an interim educational service for students suspended from school. This replaces the often unsupervised and reinforcing activities usually engaged in and develops skills to prepare students for reinstatement.

2. Social Skills Programme

   Hill-Walker "ACCEPTS" programme -

   T.A.D. (Towards Affective Development

   LIFESCIENCE

43 Behaviour Restructuring Programmes

   Anger Replacement Training (Goldstein)

   Talk Sense to Yourself (Wragg)

   Violence Prevention Curriculum (Prothrow-Smith)
4. "Coping with Violence in Schools" (Jenkin & Bowie 1993)

Represents a comprehensive approach to the problem and is delivered in four parts: 1) staff inservice 2) policy development 3) Violence curriculum for students 4) Interventions for Students identified as violent.

5. Structured Debriefing (Jenkin 1991)

Is a guided explanation for effective debriefing following critical situations and events.
SEE PORTFOLIO VOLUME 4
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Abstract

The paper describes a systematic behaviour monitoring model devised for the Robinson Unit, a special care facility established in 1994 to serve the most difficult detainees from all NSW detention centres. The brief provided by the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice prescribed a therapeutic and remedial intervention philosophy and the model was designed to facilitate this approach. Unit personnel were introduced to the model during intensive preliminary training prior to the unit becoming operational. After almost two years of involvement in the program qualitative and quantitative evaluations have been provided by participants and the adaptations, successes and shortcomings of the present program are discussed. The overall results, however, describe an equitable, individualised and client-centred approach to the management of severe behaviours delivered through a remedial and therapeutic program.

While it may be commonly held that incarceration for juveniles reinforces rather than inhibits their patterns of delinquent and deviant behaviour, some researchers have found that residential treatment can result in a sustained improvement following discharge (Weiss, K. 1994). A more responsive, supportive and rehabilitative orientation, informed by a developmental perspective, is now recognised as the preferred approach (Krisberg, B. 1994). A focus on health, educational, psychological and personal deficits indicating a necessity for specialist service delivery, and indeed, a shift towards the view that juvenile detention represents an opportunity for systematically addressing adolescent healthcare is proscribed. Some researchers focus quite appropriately on the psychopathological indicators in the behaviour of young criminals, and the impact of incarceration in terms of further compromising their mental health (Zeiller, B & Couraud-Barnoud, 1994). Counselling services also need to be reviewed and improved. Additionally, intellectual disabilities which are difficult to identify, assess and address are a priority for intervention (Juvenile Justice Green Paper, 1995). Others suggest the incorporation of personal skills development such as
mediation training, conflict resolution and anger management (Goldstein, A, 1994), as well as attention to risk-taking sexual and drug abuse behaviour (Morrison, D, 1994).

A comprehensive report on the actual confinement conditions for juveniles, identifying several areas of deficiency and neglect (Parent, D, 1994) highlights the need for a more nurturing, less punitive approach to juvenile “corrections”. The main thesis of this paper is the shift from punitive to remedial management and processes - a focus which has long received lip service and neither funding nor resources such as those offered in the program described.

Cognitive, social and behavioural restructuring processes are necessary for juvenile offenders to develop and find “status and prestige within a law-abiding society” and this represents the greatest challenge to correctional practitioners (Kvaraceus, W, 1993). Further, it is anticipated that young offenders cannot develop appropriate and successful strategies unless the family, neighbourhood, core social institutions such as schools and the judiciary and the urban community endorse rehabilitation (Office of Juvenile Justice Report, 1993). Recent researchers indicate that remedial cognitive-restructuring program carried out in structured settings produced measurable improvements and that such programs delivered across multiple settings are successful (Reid, 1993). Feldman (1994) suggests four key elements in the lives of young offenders which inform their world view and may account for their predisposition towards criminal behaviour - ethnic and racial identity, street-based training in social deviance, drug use and weapons availability, which provide the support structures for their activities. In Australia, at least three of these elements correlate closely with conditions experienced by young offenders in their social milieux and the presence of weapons is increasingly apparent. Overall, the impact and outcomes of their social experiences prescribe the future and focus of the young people who are ultimately confined. These factors needed to be considered when a behaviour management system, which could address their needs, was conceptualised.

**REMEDIAL DISCIPLINE:**

The management of significantly challenging behaviour in social institutions such as school, correctional facilities, families, workplaces and in the community has traditionally focused on a punitive model, with a more recent enlightened emphasis on a restorative and rehabilitative approach. (Braithwaite & Daly 1995)

The most common application of behaviour management plans in the more enlightened schools, detention centres, prisons and other institutions is some form of ‘levels’ system. Generally this has meant that clients begin at a particular point on a scale and can progress upwards if successful or downwards if unsuccessful in demonstrating appropriate behaviours. Clients who commit a misdemeanour are placed at a lower level, have reduced privileges and are aware of the disapproval of staff. While it may be perfectly legitimate to ‘punish’ clients who engage in misdemeanours, it is neither therapeutically nor practically useful to leave the intervention at this point. Misdemeanours are a clear indication that the client requires more intensive supervision, training and support to achieve the established
criteria of behaviour. This is unlikely to occur spontaneously as a result of punishment, exclusion and disapproval. The vertical format, particularly if labelled using numbers, can be interpreted as simply moving inexorably lower and lower down a scale to failure, which accounts for the fact that some clients will move through all levels in a day - just to get it over and done with!

Irrespective of the ethical and philosophical considerations, a belief is commonly held that punishment is necessary to deter further misbehaviour, and indeed that an hierarchy of punishments is a sound and effective management strategy. The logic of this theory is poorly supported in both the literature and the outcomes statistics (Polk, 1995). If applied in the judicial sphere it becomes apparent that punishments are often applied so late after the event, that recidivism is high (Division of Youth Report, op cit), that recipients move through the hierarchy of punishments without apparent recovery, behavioural improvements or increased awareness of their deviance and that expectations for improved social competence and compliance are rarely realised (Bessant & Watts, 1995). Criminals begin their deviant careers early and learn to “improve” their anti-social and criminal behaviours despite the punitive model and often despite the restorative and rehabilitative efforts applied.

The model described in this paper is premised on a remedial and therapeutic intervention, embedded within which may be some punitive consequences. The role of punishment is de-emphasised, and indeed deviant or unacceptable behaviours are re-interpreted as indicators of a need for more intensive remediation and supervision rather than indicators of a need for more intensive punishment. As a consequence of the increased intensity of intervention, remediation and supervision, the delinquent may well experience a loss of freedom, exclusion from preferred activities and peer interactions and he may interpret this as punitive. The difference in this model is one of therapist orientation. No professional engaged in the program needs to adopt a paternalistic and punitive role - rather, their emphasis is on offering increasingly more intensive supportive interventions to remediate the deviant behaviours. This intellectual shift in itself, prescribes a more equitable approach. Put simply, when the client engages in unacceptable behaviour the assumption is, first of all, that he has selected this behaviour, perhaps from a very limited response repertoire. Further, it is assumed that his selection of the inappropriate behaviour indicates a need for remedial intervention - he needs to be taught the more acceptable behaviour. We cannot assume that acceptable or appropriate behaviours are within his repertoire if he is not consistently demonstrating that this is so. Rather than interpreting the misdemeanour as an indicator that punishment is necessary, we must assume they are an indicator that remediation is necessary. It is only when we are sure that appropriate behaviours are within his repertoire, that we can assume they have not been selected and we can apply further training and sanctions for inappropriate choices. To punish without remediation is to reinforce or ignore the deficit. This nevertheless is the most common approach to discipline. Children and youth are punished for behaving in ways which simply indicate they have not reached a mature moral and social stage of development - but often no opportunity is offered to assist them to reach these more sophisticated and acceptable levels of performance.
The issue of accountability in behaviour management is forever present but not addressed in the same way as other responsibilities. Simply recording that punitive measures have been taken to address the problem is no longer acceptable. Remedial discipline requires that prior to any punitive measures being applied, an opportunity for learning the appropriate behaviour be offered, and that systematic documentation will clearly record therapeutic and remedial efforts applied.

A CONTINUUM OF REMEDIAL INTERVENTION:

Reflecting on the commonly implemented 'levels' systems in operation in educational settings, the ineffectiveness of the model becomes apparent. At 'upper' levels clients receive reinforcement for sustained appropriate behaviour possibly well beyond the need for extrinsic motivations. At 'lower' levels miscreants move inexorably towards more severe punishments, greater disapproval and eventual rejection and exclusion through suspension - usually an indicator that the setting has at least temporarily given up on this individual (Jenkin, 1994). The steps or levels usually involve extended periods of detention, withdrawal from activities, consultation with parents and outside agencies as well as suspension. So what is wrong with this system? Why is it that for young people who find themselves travelling the descendant steps, recovery is so difficult? Does exclusion or placement at another location really provide a "new start"? The answer is no. Nothing changes within this individual as a result of his experiences with the punitive model - he does not recover or spontaneously develop appropriate social skills and moral values. His self esteem suffers and his repertoire of behaviour is more likely to shrink than expand. It is a destructive process. Unfortunately, a similar approach has been adopted in the educational facilities provided within detention centres largely because they are staffed by Department of Education personnel. It is now apparent that this approach serves neither the criminal nor regular school client.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WELLFARE &amp; DISCIPLINE PLAN FOR GOODY SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remedial approach to discipline does not ignore the necessity for sanctions and consequences - it simply places these aspects of behaviour management within a humanistic, remedial and therapeutic model. The misdemeanour when interpreted as indicator of a need for more intensive intervention and remediation, will set in place a series of supportive, instructional programs, delivered within a framework of established criteria, which offer the individual the opportunity to improve and learn. The intensive interventions described require a greater commitment of time, effort and practice from the individual, which may mean he will spend what was previously leisure time engaged in therapeutic or remedial sessions with personnel. This is a reasonable investment given the anticipated outcomes. Leisure, of course, must be provided but will not be the priority for an individual whose behaviour is regressing. Nor should leisure be ‘earned’ - it is a right and a need just as food and rest, affection, care and enjoyment are. Nevertheless, a shift in emphasis to permit a focus on the necessary skill-building curricula is critical to improvement.

The continuum of intervention described in Figure 2 is conceptualised as a horizontal model - eliminating the negative visual image of moving progressively downwards into serious ‘trouble’. This lateral format suggests that the individual moves along a continuum of increasing intervention and support - he is not punished for his behavioural incompetencies, he is given the opportunity to address the deficiencies, and receive guidance in improvement.
**Whole Unit Progressive Monitoring Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Criteria</th>
<th>Dark Green</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Pale Green</th>
<th>Aqua</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Beige</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Pink</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage</strong></td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Integration with generalisation</td>
<td>Partial integration</td>
<td>Visits programme</td>
<td>Unit program</td>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Active resistant</td>
<td>Rejection withdrawal</td>
<td>Pre-suspension</td>
<td>In unit suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td>Preparation out of unit</td>
<td>Transfer of programme out of unit</td>
<td>Generalisation with unit consultancy</td>
<td>Generalisation training with unit staff</td>
<td>Individual in whole group</td>
<td>Develop Individualise Programmes</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>Intensified</td>
<td>Intensified adjunctive individual</td>
<td>Intense adjunctive individual</td>
<td>Intense adjunctive individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic and chaperoned</td>
<td>Partial relief</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close/huddy</td>
<td>Close/huddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td>Supervised observed or self</td>
<td>Supervised observed</td>
<td>Supervised observed</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Twice weekly</td>
<td>Three times weekly</td>
<td>Four times weekly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Twice daily</td>
<td>Three times daily</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Half hourly</td>
<td>Quarter hourly</td>
<td>Quarter hourly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gradual decrease in supervision, monitoring and programme attendance
- Increase in freedom, peer contact and independence
- Increase in supervision, monitoring and programme attendance
- Decreases in freedom, peer contact, independence
Movement towards the left on this model indicates a gradual reduction in the intensity of supervision, behavioural instruction and documentation. The rationale is that the individual who sustains appropriate behaviour indicates a relatively mature and independent capability. Once the most advanced level has been reached and sustained for a prescribed period, the necessity for further monitoring is removed and the individual may well be phased out of the program. Intermittent reinforcement, moral development, intrinsic motivation and self regulation - some of the key components which sustain appropriate behaviour throughout life for most mature individuals will usually ensure a comparatively successful behavioural outcome once basic skills are established. Movement towards the right describes the gradual increase in intervention for resistant, or disruptive behaviours which indicate a lack of behavioural competence. The components of these stages, the interventions offered, criteria for movement and other considerations will vary depending on the institutional milieu in which the model is applied. In a detention setting, individual interventions would probably include social skills and behavioural training, individualised remedial education programs and some psychological intervention and support.

APPLICATION OF THE REMEDIAL BEHAVIOUR MONITORING MODEL FOR YOUTH IN DETENTION

This model was devised for a juvenile detention facility in South Western Sydney - The Robinson Unit, which offered a specialised program for serious offenders whose behaviour in detention was a cause for concern. The unit is operational inside the Reiby Detention Centre but maintains separate staffing and administrative responsibilities from the main centre. One component of the model is the gradual integration of clients from within Robinson into the Reiby mainstream to ensure generalisation of skills, prior to the re-istatement of clients into their original correctional placement with further generalisation and monitoring follow up.

Fundamental to the effectiveness of the unit-based plan, was a consistent, predictable and objective set of guidelines, notified to all participants, which established a specific pathway from entry to graduation. The removal of subjective and arbitrary decision-making on a day to day basis is a major factor in the success of such a plan. When both clients and supervisors are familiar with the specific criteria established for movement through the plan in either a progressive or regressive direction, there is a greater probability of acceptance and compliance. Problems arise when clients become aware that supervisors can arbitrarily move them to a different place (stage) in the plan without consultation with other staff or the opportunity for the client to support his own case. It is therefore important that each position on the continuum be described in terms of exit and entry level behaviours.

It attempts to take into consideration the key elements of supervision, monitoring, documentation and specific behavioural criteria to ensure a comprehensive system of management. This reinforces the therapeutic and remedial approach, which was prescribed in the design brief.
The model incorporates a number of key components including programmes offered, the level of supervision needed, monitoring of performance and frequency of the monitoring. These were developed as essential to effective management and accountability as well as the major aim of remediation.

Colours have been used to denote stages but this could be eliminated as the stage labels are self-explanatory.

1. **DESCRIPTION OF STAGES**

The model comprises five stages in each direction - regressive and progressive. Previous models have permitted staff to move individuals to a different stage depending on personal judgements in challenging or critical situations. It is essential that criteria be established for movement though the stages with specific time periods determined before the next move. This gives unit personnel the opportunity to deliver programmes at each stage which should preclude further deterioration, and ensure progress. This stipulation also ensures that clients are seen to be treated fairly and consistently in terms of movement and have the opportunity to present a defence for movement through the plan in either direction.

It can be anticipated that clients will move through a number of psychoeducational stages (Long, N 1984) through the programme. The stages of this plan are labelled to indicate the level of independence achieved in terms of acceptable behaviours rather than numerically to indicate the depth of degradation or deficit.

1.1 **Entry**

Clients enter the Robinson unit as a result of identified problems within their detention placement including overt acting out behaviour, poor impulse control, self-harming behaviour, inability to accept responsibility for behaviour and low self-esteem, literacy and social skills (Robinson Unit Briefing Document 1994). Escapers are not offered placement in the programme. It seemed reasonable then, that a stabilisation period be provided to permit the completion of the “honeymoon” period (Long op cit) and completion of baseline data of behaviour, social and educational skills. A period of about four weeks was suggested for this stage in the model.

Programme development would include specific objectives and planning for individual needs, for example:

- **Individual Education Programme (IEP)** based on educational and vocational assessment.
- **Individual Social Skills Plan (ISSP)** based on observational data of needs in the area of social, living interaction skills, hygiene and independence.
Individual Interpersonal Skills Plan (ISP) devised to develop personal competencies in conflict resolution, anger and aggression management, negotiation, safety, assertiveness etc.

Individual Behaviour Plan (IBP) based on systematic data collection (quantitative and qualitative) and prioritisation of needs and deficiencies. Each programme requires specific skills acquisition, competencies and delivery documentation.

Movement from this level in either direction will be based on specific criteria and should not proceed until the initial "honeymoon" or "testing" periods have been completed.

1.2 Progressive Stages

1.2.1 Unit Programme
This stage represents a functional performance in all unit programmes, demonstrations of competencies and progress for a sustained period prior to integration. The client is still progressing in the programme at this level.

1.2.2 Visits Programme
This stage offers the client the opportunity to take part in out-of-unit programmes, activities and events within the host centre in preparation for further integration. This would probably entail more social than vocational or educational activities to afford the opportunity for social inclusion and interaction as a preliminary to more structured and demanding integration performance.

1.2.3 Partial Integration
This stage represents a supported integration into the host environment with unit personnel support.

1.2.4 Integration With Generalisation
This stage is completed when the client can demonstrate successful behavioural and programmatic performance at the integrated placement, without unit personnel supervision. Such successful performance would indicate internalisation of the behavioural principles necessary for sustained attendance outside the unit.

1.2.5 Graduation
Represents the most advanced stage and is reached after the client has successfully moved through four other stages of support; supervision and individual programmes.
1.3 Regressive Stage

1.3.1 Resistant
This stage will be evident when the client begins or continues to, resist directives, programme goals and peers or personnel. Movement into this level should be as a result of specific documented criteria determined by the centre.

1.3.2 Active Resistant
This stage represents a more severe level of resistance requiring a greater degree of supervision and support. Criteria to be established.

1.3.3 Rejection/Withdrawal
At this stage it is anticipated that a high degree of non-compliance, refusal to participate, deliberate attempts to damage and injure would be consistently evident. Criteria to be established.

1.3.4 Pre-Suspension Contract
This stage indicates the need for a very high level of support and supervision with exclusion to an individual programme necessary, with minimal contact with peers.

1.3.5 In-Unit Suspension
At this stage the client is fully and intensively supervised and supported and isolated from peers.

SUPERVISION

A major factor in survival and progress in juvenile detention programmes is the supervision offered to support the client (Parent, op cit). The assumption cannot be made in this plan that the client is capable of the degree of self-control and self-direction necessary to ensure their own survival and progress. Indeed, a major focus of the plan must be to offer the closest supervision possible, contingent upon performance and increased supervision for clients in a regressive phase, leading to a one-to-one “buddy” system or “minder” supervision plan. It was anticipated that this would be provided by a professional rather than a peer, although this aspect of the plan could be explored. The level of supervision moves from close though partial to basic for progressive clients and from close through to close with buddy for regressive clients.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The monitoring of performance must relate to specifically stated criteria. This part of the plan describes the degree of responsibility afforded the client in recording of his behaviour, and indicates a reduced level of independence and responsibility for clients in a regressive phase. This is partly due to the likelihood that clients in further stages
of regression are unlikely to be compliant enough to perform the monitoring procedure, and also because of the possibility of destruction of records during tantrums or aggressive episodes. Nevertheless, it is preferable that as far as possible clients be given the opportunity to at the very least observe the monitoring and record keeping of their progress, and at best, be given responsibility for their own record keeping under supervision or through periodic checking.

Both these components exemplify the remedial, supportive approach to inappropriate or resistant behaviours whilst at the same time recognising the unpleasant realities such challenging behaviours may represent. Increased supervision and monitoring is indicated for regressive individuals, however the purpose is not to provide ‘guards’ but a supportive partnership and consistent feedback to encourage progress and skills acquisition.

Frequency of monitoring required quite a complex set of guidelines for providing the individual with consistent, instructional, positive feedback towards improved behavioural performance. Fundamentally, at the most regressive stage and during in-unit supervision, the individual is provided with feedback every fifteen minutes, regarding his compliance, control and appropriate choices - and this is recorded (see figure3)

---

**Figure 3**

**Sample Record at In-Unit Suspension Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>9-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: indicates four fifteen-minute periods of compliance in a 3 hour period.

The frequency of recordings decreases as behaviour settles, to half hourly at the withdrawal/rejection stage, though to hourly when actively resistant and so on to weekly depending on consistently achieving the mandatory 80-85% compliance for a set period at each level.

**IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION**

The proposal described was introduced to management and staff during training for personnel appointed to the specialised facility in November, 1994. The brief from the Department of Juvenile Justice stated in its executive summary that the Robinson program should:
'provide an alternative, caring, containing and stabilising environment which promotes the opportunity for growth and well-being in all participants'" 

and was specifically directed towards young men in custody who engaged in violent assultative and self-harming behaviours requiring specialist attention. The themes of therapy, prevention and remediation were emphasised throughout the brief, and the program was afforded elevated status within the Department of Juvenile Justice. The intention was to re-integrate clients into their referring centres once stabilisation and progress were achieved. Personnel were selected through a stringent interview process and were regarded as having exceptional skills and/or potential for ensuring the success of the program.

Following training, personnel met for several 'retreat' days, in teams concerned with therapeutic, educational, recreational and management interventions, to formulate 'unit' plans and compose the details of their programmes.

These plans were then presented to the Department of Juvenile Justice executive, the Minister and training personnel at a special meeting. These processes confirmed the commitment of all participants to the initiative and to the new focus on a therapeutic and supportive orientation within the framework of incarceration and punishment through detention. It is fair to say that the mood of participants was hopeful, anticipatory and enthusiastic as they awaited the arrival of their first clients.

In the first two years since the program was instituted, personnel have experienced a range of incidents which have helped to forge a cohesive, supportive and ever-vigilant team whose support for each other and belief in the original concept have been reinforced through mutual need. As could be anticipated, given the special needs of the clientele, the unit has contained riotous, suicidal, violent and deviant behaviours, as well as providing the developmentally and educationally appropriate environment to support individual progress. At this point, with almost two years experience in this setting, staff present as an exemplary team of weary but undefeated professionals.

**BEHAVIOUR MONITORING & MANAGEMENT**

The complex and prescriptive behaviour monitoring and management procedure devised for the Robinson programme has been varied and simplified, losing in the authors view some of the objectivity originally intended, but gaining in terms of operational relevance - the theoretical perspective supplied in the absence of clients has been tempered through engagement with real live clients in need.

A key to the development of this focus, resulting from client contact, was the adoption of goal setting skills and behaviour for all clients. This has been a positive aspect in the educational and therapeutic programmes where young people who previously had little concept of their own roles in choosing the direction of their behaviour and lives came to the realisation that they could establish a goal and attribute acquisition to their own efforts. Goal setting is provided through the
individual counsellor case meetings with clients during which all manner of minor and major issues are discussed including such matters as what to write on a card or in a letter home in order to facilitate harmonious relationships rather than create fear and conflict.

Strategies adopted to manage behaviour have been selected and applied without reference to a ‘levels’ system - the philosophy of a punitive structure incorporating hierarchical sanctions being replaced with a supportive, negotiated and consultative approach as suggested in the plan. Further support for this approach has been incorporated through a “comment sheet” rather than the precision recording format suggested. Personnel felt that comments noted in an individual’s record book, with reference to his achievements and problems in relation to interpersonal and functional behaviours would be a more valuable record than the quantitative procedure originally devised. While this procedure was never intended to stand alone as a record of progress, but rather to be discussed with clients to provide feedback, the reduced usage of this component in favour of the qualitative data (comments) has been successful. Clients are provided with a photocopy of staff comments for the previous week and are given the opportunity to discuss the implications at their case meeting. There is no doubt clients value this approach to management. One deviation from this was the awarding of ‘points’ in the classroom setting which are recorded for privileges within class time, but this aspect, while mentioned at case meetings, was not afforded undue emphasis. Clients seem to recognise that this tangible reinforcer is situation-specific and limited in currency. The only difficulty with subjective commentary is that there is no quantifiable shift towards more appropriate behaviour, a factor considered essential to an equitable decision-making process for movement through the model. Nevertheless, the individualised character of the comments procedure is a positive aspect of the programme.

Self-monitoring of the type outlined in the original proposal, which included supervised record-keeping, has not been necessary for the most part. Rather, staff have created a set of house rules and a ‘graph’ for clients to use as a way of recording their perceptions of their own progress. This, combined with consistent reference to their personal goals for behaviour, provides an adequate record of general self-management, introspection and progress.

It was apparent in interviewing staff and clients that the procedures established are perceived as effective and equitable, and indeed though challenging and socially unacceptable at times, behaviour is generally settled to restive rather than riotous, suicidal and assaultive (this reference is to clients, naturally, not staff!) The atmosphere in the unit is not threatening although staff are vigilant and cautious.

Some shortcomings of the monitoring system are observed below, although overall the behaviour monitoring procedures are evidently successful, flexible, supportive and equitable.

**House Rules:**
The house rules are stated positively and generally refer to principles of moral development. The classification of rules into 'moral development' and 'procedural' types was discussed in the training modules. It is surprising therefore that sections of the statement identify punitive but not remedial or therapeutic consequences for breaches of the 'rules'. While some consideration is given to the level of understanding of the clients, the stated procedures represent a hierarchy of punishments - there is no indication that a therapeutic or teaching program will be implemented to address gaps in client skills and capabilities.

For example:

1. **Contact with Others**

   The rule states: *In Robinson we treat each other in a nice way.*

   It is possible to clarify the intention of this rule to mean that people ought to speak to, touch and respond to others in a generally acceptable way. Clients in Robinson may well exhibit a lack of skills in these behaviours, and may need 'being nice to others' instructions and practice. Punishment is only helpful if we can be sure the client has the required skill but chooses not to use it. It is unfortunate that the only options offered for staff, therefore are negative and punitive, e.g. a caution, additional duties, exclusion.

2. **Communication with Others**

   The rules states: *In Robinson we speak and listen with respect.*

   This is appropriate and able to be demonstrated. However, questions regarding the logic or purpose of applying suspension regulations for the behaviour must be raised, unless specific criteria are established.

   How often must one swear at others in order to receive the sanction additional duties? What if the client continues to swear during the additional duties?

   How does this punishment facilitate acquisition of, and motivation for, non-swearing behaviour?

   It is essential to establish a set of criteria and a remedial program for reinforcing non-swearing behaviour for this rule to be effective.

   It is possible that clients need specific training in 'not-swearing' behaviour.

   There are a number of other concerns with this approach

   - While a definition of correct 'contact with others' is stated, and a reasonable list of breaches included, the example of exceptions indicates:
That it will not be considered a break of the rule if the listed behaviours are engaged in during acts of self-defence, accidents, age appropriate physical contact and sport.

In reality the listed behaviours are never acceptable and are unlikely to happen by accident.

A suggested refinement of the definition could be:

Behaviours which are non-violent, non-threatening physical or social contacts including sport and physical play between residents etc.  
Note: Where accidental injury or harm is sustained or a claim of self-defence offered, incidents will be investigated.

Examples of Consequences

Breaches of House Rules come under Minor and Serious Misbehaviour as defined in the Children (Detention Centres) Regulation 1988. Subsequently consequences can include:

Section 21(1) - Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987
(a) caution;
(b) restriction from participation in sports activities for a period not exceeding 4 days;
restriction from participating in leisure activities for a period not exceeding 4 days;
(c) additional duties for a period not exceeding 7 days, being duties of a nature designed to promote the welfare of detainees;
(d) exclusion from a place not exceeding 3 hours/ confinement to a place not exceeding 3 hours.

The consequences listed range from mild to restrictive, but no criteria are offered to determine which sanction will be applied to which misdemeanour. A client should be made aware of the specific consequences for specific breaches and that some provision is made for repeat offences. The listed ‘additional consequences’ offer a reasonable selection of positive consequences/rewards but again no criteria are established for application.

How do clients earn the extra phone calls, late night etc? Are the criteria different for each client (they can be related to individual goals for each person but this should be identified in individual programs)?

Further, a more systematic approach to generalisation training and integration processes within and beyond the Reiby setting would contribute to long term benefits for participants.
While it is apparent that there is a continuing need for refinement of the therapeutic, remedial and supportive approaches implemented in the Robinson program, it is also clear from consultation with current staff that a high level of satisfaction is perceived. It is certainly clear that the arbitrary and destructive professional relationships which can develop in stressful settings between vulnerable people are entirely absent in this program. The interface between a structured and theoretical concept for behaviour management, and the reality of daily interactions has permitted the development of a functional process meeting identified needs and contributing to a more positive and rehabilitative approach for severely disadvantaged young men.

NB:

It was not possible to complete quantitative evaluations of the approaches described as tenders have been called by the Department of Juvenile Justice for a formal evaluation. Such criteria as competency standards, procedures, practices and data maintenance would provide the necessary information for a more analytical assessment, and it is anticipated this information will be available following the proposed evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION

This curriculum has been a long time coming to fruition. If we consider the endemic nature of bullying in all aspects of society it is quite remarkable that the plethora of interventions has done little to prevent and replace the phenomena. The lack simply reinforces the view so commonly held that the behaviour of others is not our concern and that to intervene is to interfere. It is hoped that through this curriculum not only will the children involved come to understand that they each have a responsibility to protect and advocate for others they see being hurt, but that the teachers, parents, and community members who come to know about the program will reinforce a responsible and protective attitude towards society’s victims.

From the playground to the boardroom—often the natural progression for bullies—and across all age, cultural and social groups; in educational, industrial, business and social institutions the bully can be found forcing his way through life at the expense of others’ psychological, physical and emotional well-being. Bullies are tolerated and trained in social environments which reinforce, condone and encourage them by open endorsement or by refusing to confront and inhibit their behaviour. Bullies are created, not born. As long as we as a community continue to accept, fail to confront and meekly submit to the commonly held misconception that a little bit of suffering will toughen kids up—particularly boys—for the harsh world outside, we are condemned to accept the consequent long-term damage such behaviour creates. The purpose of this curriculum is assist young people to recognise the behaviour of bullies, to resist, report and replace such behaviour in their lives.
Fundamentally, what we all aspire to become in life, and what we hope as teachers to assist children to become, is strong, independent, empathetic and successful individuals who can make a contribution to society. The greatest misunderstanding in this regard is that allowing individuals to use force to get their own way is the same as teaching them to be assertive and confident in seeking their place in the world. Boys in particular are socialised to believe that aggression is, in and of itself, a worthy characteristic and that achieving through destructive means is acceptable. This curriculum challenges these notions as well as the ideas that bullying is just part of life, that bullying is not harmful, that bullying shows strength and creates a resilient character. It aims to teach children that achievement is only valid when it is attained through legitimate means and that strength and masculinity are not compatible with harming others, particularly those less capable than yourself.

The notion that bullying should be tolerated because it contributes to the development of resilience in the victim needs particular examination. It is the corruption of a perfectly valid belief that experience contributes to positive growth and development. Resilience is a desirable outcome of life experience enabling us to demonstrate that we have learned to cope with challenges independently, and learned to ignore or disregard minor events which should have little impact on established self-esteem. We learn not to worry about the opinions of everybody else in the world and to get on with life without being hurt by irrelevant comments and actions. Most adults, however, would not consider deliberate abuse—verbal or physical—as an acceptable feature of their everyday lives: few would tolerate persistent and unreasonable demands for goods or favours, and most would seek help and expect to receive it if they were consistently harassed. The right to protection is seen as fundamental and we have a sense that we are entitled to go about our regular business without interference or threat of harm. Nevertheless children whose size and inexperience make them particularly vulnerable are often expected to tolerate quite severe bullying without the protection and assistance of those they turn to for help, because they are seen to be benefiting in some perverse way from the negative interactions they endure.

Finally, it is a basic premise of this program that conflict resolution is not an appropriate approach for intervention in bullying. Conflict resolution is based on the assumption that there are two equally culpable individuals who each engage in a personal struggle to have their needs met, usually at the expense of the other. It places the victim in a position of being equally responsible for the abuse which is unreasonable. Nor are victims of bullying ever expected to ‘negotiate’ with bullies to secure their own safety. Rather the curriculum intends to assist victims to develop effective behaviours to secure the protection and support to which they are entitled while at school.
CHARACTERISTICS OF BULLIES

Bullies are, first and foremost, dominant characters. This should not be confused, as it so often is, with leadership since genuine leaders have regard for the well-being of those they lead and have a legitimate purpose for leading. Bullies simply wish to impose their will on others they believe will not resist because of fear or substantial differences in situational power and strength. Bullies are self-confident and hold themselves in high regard, contrary to popular belief that bullies bully because of a need to compensate for low self-esteem. Intimidating others can be a powerful incentive to such individuals, and they describe themselves and are described by others as popular, strong, and attractive. The physical size of the bully is not always the salient factor since it is evident that children bully adults. The power differential here has more to do with the bully’s willingness to engage in threatening anti-social behaviour without regard for accepted social norms and expectations.

Bullies require individual interventions which concentrate on the development of empathy, sensitivity to others’ needs and feelings and introspection to assist in the identification of unacceptable aspects of their own behaviour. Bullies also need to be separated from victims, and denied access to the opportunity to bully them and the reinforcement such behaviour affords them. This is often the most difficult aspect of their behaviour to replace as they are consistently reinforced by having their demands met in the bullying episode. Legitimate attention and approval for the bully must be as rewarding as that achieved through bullying, yet it must be delivered only for legitimate activities. Bullies will not relinquish their power readily and certainly not for a neutral or powerless position. Therefore the teacher and others involved may need to establish a remedial intervention to teach the requisite skills. This curriculum is not designed to be an individual intervention for those identified as bullies—although their participation with the general population, of whom most are neither bullies nor victims, may well suffice to remedy this behaviour. The remedial approach rather than a purely punitive response to the behaviour means that appropriate behaviours can be identified, quantified and measured in order to ensure the bully acquires new skills in place of the old destructive ones.

Bullies need to be taught to develop healthy self-regard through legitimate achievements rather than dominance over others, and this is a key aim for all participants in the program. In order for this happen they must be shown how to RECOGNISE bullying, RESIST bullying and REPLACE bullying behaviour in collaboration with effective peers.
CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS

VICTIMS are first and foremost, individuals with no desire to be singled out for the negative attention of a bully. The victim is reluctant to retaliate because of a strongly held belief in non-violence or non-aggression or simply self preservation. They cannot see the sense or attraction in such negative interactions and are quite prepared to acknowledge the superior physical aggressiveness of the bully without feeling the need to demonstrate their own prowess or lack of it. They are not generally inclined to settle their differences physically and in some ways have developed a resilience as they are not interested in the opinion of the bully, but simply wish to be left alone. Other victims are hurt repeatedly by the claims of superiority with which the bully constantly publicly challenges them.

Victims may be singled out because of a perceived physical difference in size, shape, colour, ability or any other characteristic the bully deems worthy of denigration. Such victims are often mercilessly taunted and the pain they endure is related as much to their lack of comprehension of how another individual could be so cruel and destructive as it is to the perceived deficit which is the target of the abuse. There does not, of course need to be a real deficit or difference but the constant teasing about a particular feature will often create a deficit in the mind of the victim. Such individuals may become withdrawn and depressed, may refuse to attend school or make elaborate plans to avoid contact with the bully. Their school work may suffer and they may find it difficult to trust or relate to peers and adults. The psychological damage can be severe and long-lasting. Victims are not weak individuals who just need to learn to ‘stick up for themselves’. As the victim of a person who constantly taunts, derides and embarrasses them, despite their objections and attempts to have them desist the recipient victim can become exhausted and defeated by the lack of support offered. The feeling of powerlessness and the sense that they are not supported by others is as debilitating as the actual bullying and leads to depression and hopelessness – this is the scenario for bullied children. Victims of bullying need assistance to RECOGNISE that the behaviour they endure is bullying to, RESIST bullies by adopting effective REPORTING and help-seeking strategies, and REPLACING their ineffective responses to bullying with behaviours which demonstrate more assertiveness and resilience. This curriculum attempts to do this.

But victims cannot succeed alone—there needs to be a substantial shift in the conceptualization of bullying and the sense of responsibility others hold. Peer Advocacy is another curriculum by the author to teach the skills of representative advocacy for and with victims of peer abuse.
UNDERSTANDING BULLYING

Over the past ten years, bullying has become a major focus of research and concern in schools (Besag, 1989; Pepler 1993; Rigby & Slee, 1991). During this time, definitions of what constitutes bullying have become more refined, differentiating bullying behaviour on a number of critical dimensions from others' behaviours evident in schools including fighting, play, general conflict and violence.

DEFINING BULLYING:

REPETITION: bullying involves more than one event or incident, often occurring as a pattern of hurtful or harmful behaviour over an extended period of time, which differentiates it from episodic violence or assault (Olweus 1991)

LACK OF RECIPROCITY: bullying involves the hurtful actions of one person or a group towards another who is usually not aggressive in return. The lack of reciprocity differentiates bullying from fighting, play or conflict (Jenkin 1997, Besag 1990)

INTENTIONALITY: the purpose of bullying is to hurt the recipient. Intentionality must be examined in relation to the claimed intention of the bully (often diminishing the purpose), the actual impact on the victim and the congruence of the two (Quine 1999)

POWER: there is an unmistakable power differential between the bully and victim which does not always correlate with the size, age or social status of the bully or victim. Effective bullies may be smaller, younger or less socially powerful than the victim as their power is based in their propensity for engaging in threatening anti-social behaviour.

HARM: the perceived harm of the behaviour to the recipient is relative to individual thresholds of tolerance. Generally harm is defined by the response of the harmed individual in terms of their psychological and physical condition following the behaviour. Teachers may need to use their discretion to determine the actual degree of harm inflicted, but victims are entitled to receive some response, assistance or advice in relation to their complaint.

These criteria must be applied in any analysis of behaviours in order to identify those which qualify as bullying. While one-off instances of aggression or assault within school are distressing and certainly prescribe intervention, such incidents would not satisfy the criteria of bullying and would therefore require a different response.
The design of this curriculum developed over a number of years of research and experience in a wide range of school, remand and other educational settings. The program provides for the development of skills, attitudes and knowledge about bullying and the need to take responsibility for our own and others' safety by recognising, learning to resist and replacing bullying behaviour. The program is not designed as an individual intervention for those children who already show the signs of bullying or being the victims of bullying. The program is generic in the sense that it is intended to be delivered to all children in the upper primary grades, the majority of whom will be neither bullies nor victims of bullying. It is essential that these children, who already have a solid understanding of acceptable behaviour, be included in a program with children who are less skilled so that they can benefit from the more advanced social and behavioural repertoires demonstrated by the majority. It is quite possible that during the course of the program children who hold bullying attitudes or who appear to be victimised will be identified and will hopefully be assisted through their participation, to accept and adopt the behaviours presented. There may well be others who will require individual interventions concurrent with, or following their involvement in the Defenders program due to their continued bullying behaviour or victimisation. In the first instance, however it is imperative that such individuals are not segregated from their competent peers, and that they be given every opportunity to develop appropriate skills and competencies within the mainstream of their educational setting.

The program has been carefully designed to facilitate the development of personal competencies as well as interpersonal skills related specifically to an anti-bullying focus. There are numerous programs available to assist students to develop a range of discreet skills including assertiveness, social skills, mediation and interpersonal competencies, but this curriculum is unique in recognising that such skills cannot always be effective in isolation, and that competent individuals use a combination of skills and approaches in each problem they try to solve. This curriculum encourages participants to combine and adapt a variety of skills in their efforts to recognise, resist and replace bullying behaviour and victimisation. The intention is to teach appropriate and effective skills, behaviours and attitudes, as well as the language to communicate these in situations in which they observe, are the victims of, or are tempted to participate in bullying episodes. The program is developmental in design leading participants from less to more sophisticated concepts and practices; progress is measured and documented and feedback consistently provided. There is an opportunity for evaluation of the impact, outcomes and processes of the program throughout the presentation period.
Phases of Delivery

The program comprises three phases which delineate the level of competency and knowledge anticipated in the participants. The phases are distinctively labelled to indicate to students their progress towards the full "BULLYBUSTER" title and the level of performance of the prerequisite skills and competencies expected. Participants will be identified by their status as Apprentice BULLYBUSTER, Deputy BULLYBUSTER or full BULLYBUSTER and will progress together towards the achievement of each of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY</td>
<td>APPRENTICE BULLYBUSTER</td>
<td>RECOGNISING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BULLYING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td>DEPUTY BULLYBUSTER</td>
<td>RESISTING/REPORTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BULLYING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>BULLYBUSTER</td>
<td>REPLACING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BULLYING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1: TITLES OF PHASES AND FOCUS OF CONTENT FOR BULLYBUSTERS CURRICULUM

There is also a specific focus to each phase which identifies the main purpose of the lessons and practical activities included:

PRELIMINARY PHASE: APPRENTICE BULLYBUSTER

This phase is introductory to the concepts, behaviours, skills and language of the anti-bullying approach. It is concerned primarily with assisting students to RECOGNISE bullying in themselves, in others and in everyday situations.

INTERMEDIATE PHASE: DEPUTY BULLYBUSTER

This phase begins to introduce the skills and behaviours to assist students to RESIST bullying and introduces knowledge and skills for effective protection and safety for themselves and others through REPORTING bullying.

ADVANCED PHASE: BULLYBUSTER

This phase provides opportunities for the acquisition of more advanced skills and intervention behaviours to assist students to REPLACE bullying in their experiences, in their own and others' interactions and to refine competencies for intervention.
Development of Key Competencies and Skills

The content of the program involves the development of:
1. Personal Competencies
2. Interpersonal Skills

1. PERSONAL COMPETENCIES

Personal competencies refers to the acquisition of relevant aspects of personal development in selected focus areas which can be demonstrably shown to be influential and effective in the development of anti-bullying attitudes and behaviours, as indicated in the literature discussion for each competency included further in this program. While there are other aspects of personal development which could no doubt assist, such as self-concept and self-esteem, these may be better placed in individual interventions for those students indicating particular needs. The selected competencies are seen as generally applicable to all individuals in the development of an anti-bullying approach. The selected competencies each comprise a unit of lessons and activities within the program:

Unit 1. INTROSPECTION - the capacity to reflect upon one’s own attitudes and behaviour and assess their impact on others.

Unit 2. EMPATHY - the ability to identify and relate to the feelings and needs of others

Unit 3. TOLERANCE - the acceptance of perceived difference in others’ appearance, responses and abilities and the capacity to find similarities in others who appear different

Unit 4. ASSERTIVENESS - the ability to express needs, opinions and objections in a manner which is strong and confident without aggressiveness or passivity

Unit 5. RESILIENCE - the ability to disregard some behaviours and comments which would otherwise be hurtful and to find intrinsic satisfaction and self-regard without relying on others’ opinions. The ability to continue with regular activities despite the abuse and the capacity to seek help when needed.

The development of each of these personal competencies will assist students to become self-confident, competent individuals who are self-reliant psychologically.
2. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

Interpersonal skills refers to the actual abilities and strategies students will develop in order to protect them selves and others from bullying. These are skills which are effective, and while not exclusive in terms of efficacy are manageable for students at the developmental level of those involved in the program. In most cases the victim of bullying does not wish to be involved in any way with the bully and needs to develop the skills to enable them to recognise, resist, report and replace the current behaviours with more effective responses. The key skills selected to assist students to develop a repertoire of protective strategies are:

Unit 6. RECOGNISING THE INDICATORS-the capacity to differentiate bullying from other forms of interaction including fighting and playing, on the basis of a specific set of criteria.

Unit 7 TAKING RESPONSIBILITY—the commitment to defending the welfare of others and themselves either through strategic intervention, mediation or reporting of harmful behaviour. Students are encouraged to accept that the well-being and safety of others as well as themselves is their concern and responsibility.

Unit 8 HELP SEEKING—the ability to recognise when help is needed to protect themselves and others and the skills to seek help effectively from a range of people who can assist

Unit 9 REPORTING—the ability to differentiate behaviours which are harmful and need to be reported to those with the capacity to intervene from those behaviours which may be less threatening and which the child may be able to manage themselves; the ability to differentiate ‘dubbing’ from legitimate reporting, and acceptance of the necessity to report activities which may result in harm or hurt to others or oneself.

Unit 10 ADVOCACY—the process of speaking on behalf of or with the individual who is in need of assistance and support; the courage and persistence to continue to seek protective intervention for those who are ineffective or unable to secure protection for themselves; the ability to communicate with peers and assist them in finding solutions without judging either party; the ability to accurately describe and discuss situations in ways which clarify the unacceptable nature of the interactions;
ORGANISATION OF THE PROGRAM

This section summarises the lessons, and practice sessions for each phase of the program and clarify the developmental nature of the content. Figure 2 describes the specific units included in each phase, and illustrates progression in the acquisition of specific skills and competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL COMPETENCIES</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL SKILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INTROSPECTION</td>
<td>6 RECOGNISING INDICATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 EMPATHY</td>
<td>7 RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TOLERANCE</td>
<td>8 HELP SEEKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ASSERTIVENESS</td>
<td>9 REPORTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 RESILIENCE</td>
<td>10 ADVOCACY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2: CONTENT FOCUS IN BULLYBUSTERS PROGRAM**

The personal competencies selected for inclusion in the program are seen to contribute to an empathetic and responsible attitude towards others. It is anticipated that young people will become more aware of the needs of others for protective intervention and the level of responsibility which they can assume as an outcome of participation in the program. These attributes are developed and practised through structured lessons, resources, activities and tasks which require commitment and the satisfaction of specific criteria for performance competency. Students emerge with an improved self-worth and capacity to support others. The interpersonal competencies component facilitates the development of specific skills and procedures for identifying, resisting, reporting and replacing bullying behaviour. Overall participants become more aware and informed about the true nature of bullying as an abusive and often criminal behaviour. They develop a sense of responsibility for the safety of others and a willingness to seek assistance for those being abused. It is the development of a mature and responsible peer attitudes towards those who are the victims of peer abuse, which will eventually lead to some resolution of the bullying issue.
Table: Summary of Lessons for Each Phase of Bullybusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Personal Competencies</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Bullybuster</td>
<td>Introversion, Empathy, Tolerance, Assertiveness</td>
<td>Reporting, Help Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Bullybuster</td>
<td>Intention, Empathy, Tolerance, Assertiveness</td>
<td>Responsibility, Help Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullybuster</td>
<td>Intention, Empathy, Tolerance, Assertiveness</td>
<td>Responsibility, Help Seeking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 records the specific lessons and practice sessions incorporated into each phase. Each phase comprises twelve lessons and six practice sessions across the range of units. Each unit is supported with a variety of resources, activities, booklets and worksheets to motivate, challenge and inform participants during the course of the program. There is opportunity for frequent feedback and guidance towards more appropriate and effective behaviours as well as the capacity to identify inappropriate interactions. The program is designed to be incorporated within the physical education, health, personal development or social justice components of the general school curriculum with activities devised to test and establish relevant outcomes. Overall the purpose is to establish attitudes, behaviours and skills incompatible with bullying, however, and this is seen as a legitimate focus of education. The curriculum is not based on any specific key learning area syllabus, therefore, and content is selected to meet the goals of the program primarily. Lessons engage students in activities requiring written and spoken literacy skills but also permit alternative methods of assignment completion to maintain focus and provide stimulation. Students whose literacy is in need of support are therefore not disadvantaged as they may select from a range of tasks to indicate their performance competency.

It is anticipated that all students in the selected cohorts will be included in the program as this curriculum is not diagnostic or exclusive. Students who have experienced bullying will benefit as will students who have been involved in bullying. However their individual needs for behavioural remediation may also need to be addressed following or during the program. It may well be that this curriculum precipitates behavioural intervention at the individual level.
LESSON TOPICS

PRELIMINARY PHASE
APPRENTICE BULLYBUSTER
RECOGNISING BULLYING

PERSONAL COMPETENCIES

UNIT 1 INTROSPECTION
LESSON 1 INTROSPECTION – AM I A BULLY?
LESSON 2 INTROSPECTION – MY FRIENDSHIP STYLE
PRACTICE 1, 2

UNIT 2 EMPATHY
LESSON 1: EMPATHY- BULLYING HURTS
LESSON 2: EMPATHY – WHO WAS HURT?
PRACTICE 1.

UNIT 3 TOLERANCE
LESSON 1 TOLERANCE – SPECIAL PEOPLE
LESSON 2: TOLERANCE OF DIFFERENCE
PRACTICE 1

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

UNIT 6 RECOGNISING INDICATORS
LESSON 1: RECOGNISING INDICATORS– IS THIS BULLYING?
LESSON 2: RECOGNISING INDICATORS– WHO WAS BULLIED?
LESSON 3: RECOGNISING BULLYING
PRACTICE 1, 2

UNIT 7 RESPONSIBILITY
LESSON 1: RESPONSIBILITY – WHOSE PROBLEM IS IT?
LESSON 2: RESPONSIBILITY– NOT MY PROBLEM?
PRACTICE 1

REPORTS /AWARD OF APPRENTICE BULLYBUSTER CERTIFICATE
PERSONAL COMPETENCIES

UNIT 2 EMPATHY
LESSON 3 EMPATHY - NO LAUGHING MATTER
LESSON 4 EMPATHY - HOW DOES IT FEEL?
PRACTICE 2

UNIT 3 TOLERANCE
LESSON 3 SAME OR DIFFERENT?
LESSON 4 DIFFERENT OR SAME?
PRACTICE 2

UNIT 4 ASSERTIVENESS
LESSON 1: ASSERTIVENESS – WHAT DID I SAY?
LESSON 2: ASSERTIVENESS – SAY WHAT YOU MEAN
PRACTICE 1

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

UNIT 7 RESPONSIBILITY
LESSON 3
PRACTICE 2

UNIT 8 HELP-SEEKING
LESSON 1: WHO CAN HELP?
LESSON 2: WHO NEEDS HELP?
PRACTICE 1

UNIT 9 REPORTING
LESSON 1 'DOBBING'
LESSON 2 REPORTING – JUST THE FACTS
PRACTICE 1 REPORT CARD

REPORTS/ AWARD OF DEPUTY BULLYBUSTER CERTIFICATE
PERSONAL COMPETENCIES

UNIT 4 ASSERTIVENESS

LESSON 3: ASSERTIVENESS – WHAT DID I SAY?
LESSON 4: ASSERTIVENESS – SAY WHAT YOU MEAN
PRACTICE 2

UNIT 5 RESILIENCE

LESSON 1 RESILIENCE  COPING NOT DROWNING
LESSON 2 RESILIENCE  CARRYING ON
LESSON 3 RESILIENCE  BOUNCING BACK
LESSON 4 RESILIENCE  TAKING THE CHALLENGE
PRACTICE 1,2

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

UNIT 9 REPORTING
LESSON 3 REPORTING BEYOND SCHOOL
LESSON 4 REPORTING FOR PROTECTION
PRACTICE 2

UNIT 10 ADVOCACY

LESSON 1: STICKING UP FOR OTHERS
LESSON 2: WHO NEEDS AN ADVOCATE?
LESSON 3 ADVOCACY IN ACTION
LESSON 4 ADVOCACY LET ME HELP
PRACTICE 1 ADVOCACY AT PLAY, PRACTICE 2

REPORTS/ AWARD OF BULLYBUSTER CERTIFICATE
NATIONAL
PROTECTIVE BEHAVIOURS
CONFERENCE
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CANBERRA A.C.T.
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ABSTRACT:

The paper briefly reviews current research data and international philosophical perspectives on the broadening field of bullying, in order to describe the impetus for the creation of the Bullybusters intervention. "Bullybusters" is a general anti-bullying curriculum devised for primary aged children to teach skills and information for dealing with bullying behaviour. As an intervention it focuses on the development of personal strengths in empathy, assertiveness and resilience, and interaction skills including mediation, communication and helping. The programme is designed to be delivered over a six week period with senior primary students and follows a developmental model leading from apprentice-to-deputy-Bullybuster as the child exhibits the requisite skills and knowledge. As an adjunct, it is expected that some children would be identified through the program as requiring individual therapeutic intervention for victimisation or bullying behaviour.

There can be no doubt about the links between early bullying behaviour and later criminality. (Olweus 1993, Tatum 1992) - and these facts point to an urgent need to address the cycle of violence and intimidation which bullies initiate.

Bullies are created and trained in social environments which condone, reinforce and encourage their behaviour, victims are often ignored, ridiculed and further victimised due to social myths which suggest that the physical and emotional torture they are suffering is just part of "growing up". It is a commonly held view that a little bit of suffering will 'toughen boys up' for the big bad real world. In fact, when questioned, the fathers, uncles, coaches and teachers of boys will deny they are trying to create bullies who will beat and intimidate their wives and children. Nevertheless, as long as we as a community continue to accept, fail to confront and meekly submit to the male ethic of intimidating boys into manhood this way we are destined to perpetuate the current situation. Bullies are created, not born. The same myths do not seem to apply to female bullies.

The issue of 'maleness' is a big factor in any exploration of the bullying paradigm - some researchers go so far as to state that it is 'causal' (Egger 1995) not simply correlational.

The major focus of reports, research, books and discussions on the topics of bullying and being bullied has, to date, been to quantify and describe the phenomenon as an attempt to delineate its topography. It is certainly time now to explore a comprehensive approach to intervention, comprising school policy, training of personnel and individual therapeutic methods. It is also time to acknowledge bullying
as a serious curriculum focus and a pressing and legitimate responsibility of parents and teachers. It is time for systematic intervention through well constructed, and delivered readily available programs. In short, it is time bullying entered the mainstream of consciousness to ensure that myths and traditions suggesting that bullying is "just part of growing up" are finally rejected.

Psychologically, victims of bullying suffer over a long period of time from the effects of the bully's acts and long after the actual behaviour has been stopped. The destruction of self image, confidence and security resulting from systematic bullying, has life-long implications. Depression, withdrawal and adjustment problems result from victimisation. The victim is unhappy, cautious, anxious and wary in a range of social situations and finds it difficult to trust adults and friends who fail to intervene on their behalf. They feel and behave as lonely and abandoned individuals, (Olweus 1991,) their intellectual and academic functioning suffers and their ambitions are extinguished. It is little wonder that a number of children who have been relentlessly victimised have committed suicide. Victims have lower self esteem (Byrne 1994) on a range of dimensions and demonstrate a realistic assessment of their own capacities when rated on a multi-dimensional scale (Marsh 1991) which describes academic and social functioning separately.

Another factor related to victims identified as having an effect in terms of their victimisation is over protective parenting. Since victims are often smaller, more sensitive and quieter than boys their own age (Byrne, 1994), they often have closer family relationship, particularly with mothers, and this is interpreted as "overprotectiveness" by some researchers (Olweus, 1993). This is a somewhat circular cause and effect theory but it is possible that reduced social interactions due to characteristics of shyness, and natural temperament (introversion) may result in a perceived weakness in character and hence overly protective mothering and rejection by the father (Olweus opcit). This in turn exposes the vulnerable child to victimisation. On the other hand, victimisation is likely to lead to the development of withdrawal and avoidance of social contact for children whose experiences in such situation are negative.

**MODEL OF VICTIMISATION**

Figure 1 describes a model for identifying the degree of victimisation of the selected individual, and indicates that a passive victim will endure the greatest degree of victimisation. The figure also rationalises the position of the so-called “provocative victim” (Slee 1993, Pikas 1989) In this paradigm, there is equivalence between bully and partner in the bullying cycle. Since there is a degree of reciprocity in the behaviour, often with a good deal of covert collusion, teasing and counterplay, - this individual cannot be ranked on the scale of victimisation which describes the experience of the passive victim. While there can be victimisation and bullying in this relationship, if both participants exhibit and endure both types of behaviour, the parallel cannot be drawn with genuine non-retaliatory victims. The “provocative victim” by virtue of their deliberate and assertive behaviour is a contradiction in terms. This character is not a victim at all but a partner to bullying and must be alerted to the self-induced “status” their tormenting behaviour creates. If two
individuals alternatively torment and suffer from each other, they have established a mutually dependent relationship which replaces the bully-victim, dominant-passive, one-dimensional relationship usually described.

The model illustrates that there is an interrelationship between the degree of victimisation on the part of the victim and the desire to hurt others on the part of the bully, which incidentally may have its origins in a pathological lack of empathy. Obviously, if the victim is passive, the opportunity is available for the bully to behave aggressively as there is little likelihood of retaliation. A distinction should be drawn though between individuals who hurt others because they have a total lack of empathy - in which case they act from ignorance rather than malice, and individuals who hurt others so that they can enjoy their discomfort and pain. The latter category of bully is more dangerous and destructive by far.

The model (figure 2) also attempts to illustrate the way in which an intervention may be structured so that over the period of the program, the degree of victimisation will reduce as the level of assertive behaviour increases in victims and the bully’s level of desire to hurt others is lowered while his aggressive behaviour is modified. This is the most challenging aspect of any intervention with bullies. It cannot be assumed that either party is willing or able to develop alternative behaviours other than those evident in the abusive relationship. The proposition is that all parties should be given specific instruction and guidance in more effective and acceptable behaviours, but that ultimately they will have to fly alone.

**A MODEL FOR INTERVENTION & RESILIENCE**

A specific paradigm can be applied to bullying - victim relationships across the lifespan that will no doubt cause some controversy and a possible backlash. Nevertheless the totally passive, victim, incapable of retaliation and incapacitated emotionally and socially by the bully who dominates their life can no longer merely be offered support and Band-Aid solutions. Intensive remedial intervention in the deviant relationship must be offered - either formally through recognised services, or informally, though often equally effectively through community education and action. “Victims” to become survivors must be given access to skill building programs which identify and remediate interaction deficits and teach assertiveness. Designing and presenting specific training programs to address the gaps on social and interpersonal skills which such victims often demonstrate in response to bullying, is a major and crucial direction for the helping professions.

Victims suffer from deviant relationship which bullies initiate and sustain and they need to be given new choices which build assertiveness, independence and self-esteem. Motivating victims is a difficult task, but nursing them is harder. We must move beyond the medical model which views victims as passive recipients of all sorts of healing and therapeutic treatment. Patients of any kind are usually expected to begin working towards their own recovery after a period of nursing. They are encouraged to avoid the damaging activities and environments which contributed to their demise, and they are no doubt tutored in effective and preventative behaviour to avoid further injury. The same model must be systematically applied to the victim of
bullying. Of course the damaging activities, environments and organisations must also be treated or eliminated and hopefully the original victim will participate in the process.

Further some clarification is required of what is a commonly held view that bullying actually contributes to the development of a resilient and strong 'character'. A number of myths perpetuate this view - one of them being that reporting incidents of bullying is a 'weak' response - this view is expressed by both students and adults alike. On the contrary it is clear that if we give victims the message that legitimate reporting is undesirable then we are condemning them to a life of passivity. Withholding reports and failing to seek assistance represents passivity, not assertiveness, and such children will continue to be victimised throughout their lives if they are discouraged from adopting self-help and proactive strategies. Adults who thus expect victims of bullying to 'cope' and resist intervention work in favour of the bully. Resistance is a characteristic which is developed over time as a means of protecting the self from psychological hurt. We certainly become less inclined to respond emotionally and with distress to minor verbal attacks as we mature and we are able to psychologically protect ourselves. In less severe incidents this is quite appropriate. We also reserve the right to report and seek assistance in other circumstances and children should be afforded the same opportunity.

Bullies present a diverse and challenging cluster of behaviours, fostered through practice and approval and reinforced by victims who provide goods and services on demand. Bullying behaviour is a choice deliberately selected by individuals who, often, have a limited repertoire of alternative behaviours on which to draw when engaged in social interactions. The challenge here is to substitute empathy, care, sympathy, appropriate social consciousness and assertiveness for the deviant behaviours and attitudes evident in their behaviour. For some bullies, this transformation is achievable through a series of programmed interventions which follow a "no blame" (Maines & Robinson, 1992) "shared concern" approach (Pikas, 1991). However, it must be said that for the dedicated bully, such substitution is most unlikely. His preferred response style is aggressive, demanding, egocentric and lacking empathy. He may not be capable of recognising and responding to others' misery except to enjoy the power it delivers. Programs relating to anger management, social skills, conflict resolution and violence prevention will not be effective because they attempt to convince the bully to engage in behaviours which are less successful and less rewarding than the bullying behaviour. Unless his moral reasoning and capacity for empathy can be precipitated through the intervention he will not experience a genuine transformation - although he may learn to "affect" the behaviours being promoted. Bullies actually enjoy and gain satisfaction from the behaviour and this is hard to interrupt.

**INTRODUCTION TO "BULLYBUSTERS CURRICULUM"**

This curriculum reflects an empathetic view of the phenomenon of bullying in the lives of young people. Empathetic in that it seeks to address the inadequacies, needs and concerns of both bully and victim; in that it does not seek to lay blame, punish and reject the bully but rather to explore the psychology of his deviance and suggest
ways he can be encouraged to alter his inappropriate interaction style. It is empathetic also in that it does not merely sympathise with victims but seeks to determine how they, too, can alter inadequate behaviours in the bullying context towards a more assertive and confident co-existence.

Fundamentally the “Bullybuster” program does not seek in the first instance to separate bullies and victims in the general classroom situation. It does not seek to ‘bust’ bullies - but rather bullying behaviour. During the course of the program, through expressed attitudes and performance, individuals requiring more intensive follow up intervention will be identified - either as recipients or perpetrators of bullying. Ultimately they will require individualised intervention programs. The Bullybuster Curriculum is designed to inform all parties (students, parents, teachers) of the basic aetiology of bullying and victimised behaviour. It identifies, illustrates and confronts specific activities and interactions which comprise the bully-victim paradigm. It teaches and demonstrates ways to reduce or avoid destructive interchanges.

This program is for people who are concerned that a child they know and care about is being hurt or frightened by another child or adult; but equally it is for those who are concerned that a child they know and care about is exhibiting bullying behaviour. This program will clarify issues for both and will assist in re-directing the focus child in a more effective way.

A major focus must be to raise the social profile of bullying behaviour - this is not to improve its status! - but to have it placed firmly on the social issues agenda, along with conservation and wife-battering. In Australian society, in particular, the view that certain behaviours which denigrate, intimate, humiliate and offend some people are justifiable because they satisfy and titillate others, must be challenged.

The curriculum will comprise a boxed kit with lessons and resources to support the underlying philosophy that a generic program to inform all children of the topography of the bullying situation is an essential inclusion in all school programs. The curriculum is designed to be delivered over a six week period, to senior primary children to begin with, then through the grades to Year 3 so that eventually all children in the primary division will have been inducted and will reinforce each other in the observation and reporting of bullying behaviour. The program has been designed to be appealing and attractive, with a cute logo used on badges, T-shirts, report forms and palm card which reinforces the message that the child has become a ‘BULLYBUSTER’!

If potential victims can be identified and current victims located, programs to teach effective skills can be introduced to secure long and short term control of their social interactions. Bullies and the social environments in which they are allowed to operate must, however, be the prime targets of intervention and change if the problem is to be reduced.

A comprehensive approach at home, at school and in the general community comprising policy training for personnel and specific curricula for children must be adopted. Pro-bullying attitudes in a wide range of activities and institutions -
including sports and schools - must be challenged and support delivered to those prone to victimisation if we are to develop into an equal and safe society.
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FIG. 1 PROPOSED PARADIGM OF INTERACTION BETWEEN BULLY AND VICTIM, BEHAVIOURAL RESPONSES, INCLUDES POSITION OF THE ‘PROVOCATIVE VICTIM’
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Abstract
Peer Advocacy represents an innovative and research-based approach to the preparation of young people for the shared responsibility of protection and support of their peers. This paper describes the functional components of the Peer Advocacy intervention. It locates the process of Peer Advocacy within the framework of a comprehensive approach to intervention in bullying in schools. It is implemented ideally within a supportive environment which acknowledges the damaging effects of peer abuse. It is embedded within the school-wide anti-bullying curriculum which assists young people to develop relevant personal competencies and interpersonal skills in preparation for the role of Peer Advocate. The theoretical underpinnings of Peer Advocacy as an intervention in bullying are described elsewhere, (Healey, in press) and are linked to original research which identified peer attitudes and competencies in relation to bullying. The structure and processes of Peer Advocacy as a training program comprising a set of guiding principles, operational principles, knowledge and procedures related to the role of advocacy as a bullying intervention are described in detail here. The program equips young people with the skills, motivation and commitment to assist their bullied peers in the quest for protective intervention. The objective is for relevant personal attributes, specific knowledge and informed advocacy skills to be developed and demonstrated as a result of inclusion in the program. It is an innovative and advanced program of intervention reliant upon the courage, skill and tenacity of young people in defence of each other even when those in authority are unresponsive to the need for protection.
Peer Advocacy - A Functional Response To Resisting Bullying:

Structure and Processes.

Jean B. Healey

Peer Advocacy is a structured training program to assist young people in secondary schools to develop the skills required to recognise, resist, report and replace bullying behaviours through representative advocacy. The Peer Advocacy intervention is an anti-bullying curriculum, located as a component within a comprehensive whole-school anti-bullying initiative such as the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention (Healey, 2003). The Peer Advocate is typically a school student attending a regular educational facility within which processes have been or are being established to deal with bullying comprehensively. Young people in middle and upper secondary educational levels are trained to recognise bullying through the systematic application of criteria, to accept responsibility for intervention on a range of appropriate and manageable levels and to apply structured processes to secure the protection of their peers. A theoretical construct for Peer Advocacy has been described with reference to recent original research (Healey in press). Further, the concept is grounded in theories of advocacy, the psychology of victimization and resilience, social capital and child protection and discussion in relation to an examination of these theories, not previously considered in relation to bullying, is also available (Healey, unpublished). Each of these can be shown to support the notion that bullied young people can secure the assistance and intervention to which they are entitled by seeking help from trained and trusted peers who then act for and with them in their approaches to authorities.

Preliminary Considerations

Peer Advocacy represents the establishment of a partnership which supports self-protective responses to abusive behaviour, not a dependent relationship whereby passivity is reinforced. The process of accessing and collaboration with a Peer Advocate are in themselves pro-active responses on the part of the victimised individual, which will assist in the development of further effective behaviours. Peer Advocates are a means by which the case for the victim can be put to supportive and committed authority figures who have the power to intervene and change the circumstances whereby bullies have unlimited and unsupervised access to their victims.
Without the establishment of such a structured process, victims are left to formulate their own responses to bullies, often with devastating psychological consequences. (Ambert, 1995; Portwood, 1999; Roscoe 1990, Rigby & Slee, 1993) When schools commit to a thorough approach to intervention in bullying,(Healey, 2003) there is a need to identify as one component, a curriculum which will inform the whole school student population about the specific characteristics of the bullying paradigm. (see Figure 1). Peer Advocacy is one such program of information and education addressing commonly held misconceptions about bullying, identifying behaviours which indicate an individual may be a bully or may be a victim of bullying, and providing training in a range of interpersonal and personal competencies to support the advocacy process.

The program is not designed as an individual intervention for those who already show the signs of bullying or being the victims of bullying. The training is generic in the sense that it is intended to be delivered to all students in the selected cohort, the majority of whom will be neither bullies nor victims of bullying. It is essential that these students, who already have a solid understanding of acceptable behaviour, be included in a program with others who are less skilled so that the latter can benefit from the more advanced social and behavioural repertoires demonstrated by the majority. In this program, identified bullies are not excluded but are expected to undertake the same training procedure as other students. It is anticipated that during the process of training the attitudes and behaviours of bullies will be transformed towards more supportive interactions. It is also anticipated that during the course of the program individuals who appear to be victimised will be identified and will be assisted through their participation, to accept and adopt the more acceptable and effective behaviours presented.

It may well be that this does not eventuate and some will require individual interventions concurrent with, or following their involvement in the program due to their continued bullying behaviour or victimisation. In the first instance, however it is imperative that such individuals are not segregated from their competent peers, and that they be given every opportunity to develop appropriate skills and competencies within the mainstream of their educational setting. The program is designed as a series of units of study to be delivered as a complete program over a period of one school term in all likelihood through the health physical education, social justice or personal development curriculum areas.

It is recommended that the students involved be from the middle or upper years of high school to ensure a measure of maturity and status. However it may be that the students most involved in the bullying paradigm need to be trained for supportive intervention during the most salient period of the problem. Bullying is endemic in the early years of high school (Rigby & Slee, 1993; Smith, 1999) and peers are less likely to hold supportive and empathetic views of the experiences of bullied individuals.

The induction of years nine and ten into the procedures will provide a team of skilled individuals whose successful interventions for younger students will motivate the younger students to adopt the role of Peer Advocate in their turn.
It may take some years to establish such a supportive culture but the long-term benefits are evident. There is no question that the program requires long-term commitment and resourcing as does the whole effort to overcome bullying.

Structure Of The Peer Advocacy Program

The design of the program developed over a number of years of research and experience in a wide range of school, and other educational and correctional settings. It also builds on the skills and knowledge introduced in the Resolving Violence secondary anti-violence curriculum (Jenkin, 1996) by the same author. The program comprises units of study involving highly motivating and engaging activities and lessons with particular emphases related to bullying intervention. Fundamentally, the process of Peer Advocacy necessitates the training of young people in a series of procedures which facilitates their more effective assistance for peers who are the victims of bullying. These young people are not required to make judgements about the morality of the bully’s behaviour, nor are they commissioned to seek punishment or retribution on the victim’s behalf. The role of the Advocate is to support the victim of bullying in their efforts to receive assistance and intervention to recognize, resist and replace bullying in their lives.

Phases of Delivery

The program comprises three phases of delivery which delineate the level of competency and knowledge anticipated in participants. The phases are distinctively labelled to indicate to students their progress towards the full title and responsibility and the level of performance expected in terms of prerequisite skills and competencies. Initially, participants develop and successfully demonstrate competency of several personal capacities: introspection, empathy, resiliency, assertiveness and responsibility. Participants also acquire knowledge and information specific to bullying intervention and commit to accepting a level of responsibility for the protection of bullied peers. This occurs prior to attempting specific advocacy training with the purpose of attaining the responsible position of Peer Advocate.

Focus of the Phases of the Peer Advocacy Program

Preliminary Phase: Apprentice Peer Advocate
This phase addresses the development of Personal Attributes relevant to bullying intervention and focuses on learning about and demonstrating specific personal competencies which are relevant to the process of advocacy. These comprise: introspection, empathy, assertiveness, resiliency and responsibility. Participants must demonstrate the attribute in their daily lives and will achieve recognition, for the performance of activities which indicate their presence.
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Participants compile an achievement portfolio which is verified by parents, sports coaches, ministers and other significant people in the life of the individual so that all five attributes are confirmed. Students progress to the next phase upon completion. The program is designed to ensure that opportunities are created for the demonstration of these criterion-based competencies in a challenging but enjoyable way.

**Intermediate Phase: Deputy Peer Advocate**
This phase addresses Knowledge and Skills in relation to school, systemic, legal and community protective structures to be accessed in the event of the need for protective intervention. This phase begins to introduce the skills and behaviours to assist students to recognise and resist bullying and introduces knowledge and skills for effective protection and safety for themselves and others. Knowledge and commitment are required performance bases for this phase demonstrated in the production of a series of posters, pamphlets, booklets and other shared materials which identify bullying, commit to accepting responsibility for help-seeking, and disseminate knowledge about the school, community and legislative protections available for those who are being victimised in any way.

**Advanced Phase: Peer Advocate**
This phase addresses Advocacy Processes related to the capacity of the participant to implement prescribed and supported procedures to secure protection for those being bullied. It provides opportunities for the acquisition and demonstration of more advanced skills and intervention behaviours to assist students to replace bullying in their experiences, in their own and others’ interactions and to refine competencies for notification and intervention. This phase teaches the history and philosophy of advocacy. It also presents the guiding and operational principles of Peer Advocacy, as well as the procedures for consulting, documentation, reporting and intervention in bullying incidents. On completion of this phase trained Peer Advocates volunteer to act on behalf of those in need of protective intervention. It is at this point that the skills and strategies for support are implemented to protect others.

**Key Components Of The Peer Advocacy Intervention**

**Basic Premises**

Peer Advocacy is premised on empathy, responsibility, respect, objectivity, fairness, privacy and action. Peer Advocacy is premised on the need for persistent and patient help-seeking and support when assistance is not immediately forthcoming. Peer Advocates act as independent and ethical spokespersons for those in need of protective intervention because of peer abuse. Details of the basic premises upon which the program is based are contained in the appendix.
Guiding Principles For Peer Advocacy

Peer Advocacy is based on the following guiding principles, each of which is addressed in the structured training program presented in secondary schools. These principles are detailed in the appendix.

G. P. 1. Knowledge and Acceptance of Key Factors Defining Bullying

G. P. 2. Human And Individual Rights Model

G. P. 3. Equal Opportunity Model

G. P. 4. Empowerment Through Partnership

G. P. 5. Voluntary Participation

G. P. 6. Independence, Integrity and Courage in Representation

G. P. 7. Legislative Validity

G. P. 8. Acceptance of Responsibility

G. P. 9. Confidentiality and Ethical Processes

G. P. 10. Commitment to Resolution

Operational Principles For Peer Advocacy

These operational principles are meant to provide an ethical structure to the operational processes to be outlined further for Peer Advocacy. They are worded within the context of the program in such a way as to be comprehensible to students, and while the principles enshrined in the process are morally sophisticated, the acquisition of them is not beyond sensitive, committed and motivated young people. These principles are detailed in the appendix.

Training for Peer Advocacy imparts the following principles for operating on behalf of and with those seeking help to resist bullying:

O. P. 1. Training/ Certification:

O. P. 2. Availability/ Accessibility

O. P. 3. Responsible Practice:

O. P. 4. Confidentiality:

JEAN B. HEALEY
PAPER PRESENTED AT SELF RESEARCH CENTRE
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
BERLIN, GERMANY JULY 2004
O. P. 5 Individualised Support:

O. P. 6 Practice of Peer Advocacy:

O. P. 7 Documentation and Monitoring

O. P. 8 Resourcing and Supporting Peer Advocacy

O. P. 9 Conduct of meetings

O. P. 10 Participants in the process

PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR PEER ADVOCACY

Figure 3 describes the process undertaken in the Peer Advocacy intervention. These are detailed in the appendix. A series of structured meetings are held at the request of the complainant with a specific focus in each meeting. Guidelines for the conduct of meetings and the completion of the documentation is provided for the Peer Advocate in their training manual. The outcomes of each meeting are documented in forms (F1-F7) devised for the purpose of tracking the progress of the intervention. All such documentation is contained in the Peer Advocacy Record booklet provided for each complainant but retained by the Advocate. Each of the following processes is undertaken, according to a timetable which suits the complainant and/or the particular circumstances of the complaint.

More urgent requests for intervention may expedite the process while less distressed complainants may require a slower application of the process.

Contact/ Invocation of Process
 Assessment of Problem
 Needs Analysis/
 Selection of Procedures:
 Selection of Intervention:
 Implementation and Monitoring
 Review Outcomes
 Review Processes
 Closure and Resolution

It is important to note that at no stage in this program, although it is common in others, is the victim of bullying ever required to ‘negotiate’ with the bully. This program is premised on the understanding that such an approach to abusive relationships is inappropriate and further victimises the individual. (Healey, in press).
However, should the complainant decide to approach the bully on their own behalf to express their resistance, this would be supported and documented by the Advocate. Further, in Intervention 1 the Advocate may undertake the advocacy process on behalf of the victim with the bully and may well secure a resolution in this case. Similarly to other abusive situations however the likelihood of changing the behaviour of the abuser by simply requesting such a change is remote.

Summary

The structures and processes of the Peer Advocacy program outlined here describe an original and innovative approach to intervention in bullying. They also represents a controversial and more formalised response to the issue of securing protective intervention for victims of bullying. This structure emerged through the examination of original research data which indicates the forms of behaviour evident in bullying at this level (Healey, Dowson & Bowen, 2003), and the willingness and capacity of peers of bullied individuals to offer support (Healey, in press). It is also premised on the theoretical perspectives related to peer abuse as child abuse (Healey, 2001) and a range of related theoretical viewpoints including social capital, resiliency and advocacy generally. The program is intended for inclusion within a supportive school community which is in the process of implementing a comprehensive intervention in bullying. Nevertheless, the program stands alone as a protective strategy for resisting bullying and may be offered and implemented with any cohort of concerned peers, to ensure the support and protection of those in need.
Figure 1. Structure of the Peer Advocacy Process

- **Peer Advocacy Training Completed Successfully and Certified**
  - *Availability through School Email Address*  
  - *Voluntary Participation*
- **Request for an Interview**
- **Duty Peer Advocate Contacted by Complainant**
- **Detailed Written Complaint Provided**
- **Initial Interview Provides Details**
- **Document Details**
- **Meeting 1**
  - Interview to Discuss Details
  - Adoption of Documented Details (F1)
  - Contract to Invoke Process (F2)
  - Identify Key Complaint
    - E.G. Bullying Incidents
    - Multiple Billies (F3)
    - Identify Secondary Complaints (F3)
    - E.G. Lack of Support
- **Meeting 2 (F3) (F4)**
  - Assessment of Specific Problems
  - Determine Objectives (F4)
  - Prioritise Objectives
- **Select Procedure(s) (F5)**
- **Select Intervention(s) (F6)**
- **Implement & Monitor Intervention**
- **Review Outcomes (F6)**
- **Resolution & Closure (F7)**

---
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PEER ADVOCACY
JEAN B. HEALEY

A CURRICULUM FOR SECONDARY STUDENTS

TO INTERVENE IN BULLYING
Key Components Of Peer Advocacy

Basic Premises

Peer Advocacy is premised on empathy, responsibility, respect, objectivity, fairness, privacy and action. Peer Advocacy is premised on the need for persistent and patient help-seeking and support when assistance is not immediately forthcoming. Peer Advocates act as independent and ethical spokespersons for those in need of protective intervention because of peer abuse.

Peer Advocates demonstrate these qualities by:

- listening to or reading complaints about bullying and accepting their validity
- explaining the processes and procedures for the reporting of bullying and invocation of the advocacy process
- offering a range of assistance options
- acting as a go-between for the complainant with those in authority whose help is sought,
- encouraging the complainant to formalise their complaint and to seek help
- accompanying the complainant to meetings with those in authority to explain the situation, describe the events and request intervention.
- maintaining ongoing help and support for the emotional and practical needs of the victim following the reporting of the events
- speaking for the person represented if necessary
- Following the specified procedures for the reporting of bullying
- Focussing the advocacy sessions on the establishment of an intervention to the benefit of the person represented

Peer Advocates do not:

- discuss the complaint with the individual identified as the bully
- behave in a negative, rejecting or accusational manner towards the individual identified as the bully
- discuss the complaint or related matters with others not involved in the issues
- seek punishment or retribution on behalf of the complainant
- investigate the complaints received
- act on behalf of the complainant without their permission
Guiding Principles For Peer Advocacy

The Peer Advocacy program fits as a curricular component within a whole school approach to the management of bullying (see Figure 1). Peer Advocacy is based on the following guiding principles, each of which is addressed in the structured training program presented in secondary schools.

G. P 1. Knowledge and Acceptance of Key Factors Defining Bullying

- familiarity with the defining features of bullying including -
  -lack of reciprocity,
  -frequency, intensity and duration of the events
  -intention to harm
  -misuse of power position, authority or strength
- acceptance that some individuals are bullied and that the experience is harmful and distressing
- acceptance of the need to offer structured support and to seek assistance for a peer who has been identified as bullied
- disapproval of bullying and action to discourage the practice

G. P. 2. Human And Individual Rights Model

- acceptance and promotion of the right of each individual to be free from intimidation, harm, fear and danger in their everyday interactions with others,
- familiarity with Human Rights and Children's Rights mandates, and an ability to refer to these models when seeking assistance for their partner

G. P 3. Equal Opportunity Model

- acceptance that bullying and intimidation on the basis of gender, ethnicity, religion, ability or preferences is not acceptable
- striving to ensure individuals are treated equally and fairly
- use of training and knowledge to ensure all individuals are given the opportunity to be heard, supported and assisted.
G. P. 4. Empowerment Through Partnership

- attempting to develop in those seeking advocacy the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to ensure their freedom from bullying in the future
- partnership in seeking assistance, guidance and intervention from those with the capacity and authority to make positive changes,
- encouragement of self-advocacy in victims of bullying, through physical, emotional and social support during reporting and help-seeking
- keeping partners informed of the processes, procedures, rules, services and supports available to assist them in their quest for assistance
- refusal to advocate on behalf of the bully

G. P. 5. Voluntary Participation

- voluntary participation in Peer Advocacy practice following training because of a commitment to helping, caring and acting on behalf of victims of bullying
- participation for no reason other than the intrinsic reward of having contributed to the welfare and safety of another individual
- availability to advocate on behalf of, or with an individual seeking assistance.

G. P. 6  Independence, Integrity and Courage in Representation

- refusal to be influenced by others whose power, authority or strength could impose improper limitations on the help offered to victims of bullying. This could include parents, teachers, community members, sports coaches, friends and others who may seek to discourage their impartial involvement and continued advocacy for victims
- offering assistance to individuals, not groups who may have collective influence, unless the group represents individuals who are each victimised
- seeking changes to processes, procedures and situations in order to benefit those in need irrespective of the disapproval or resistance of those in authority or power
G. P.7 Legislative Validity

- awareness of the legal obligations of teachers and others working with children to protect them from abuse and to report abusive and harmful practices through mandatory notification
- awareness of the provisions of the Children and Young Persons Act 1998, as well as harassment, discrimination and assault provisions under the law to protect young people from harm
- awareness of the availability of other legal regulations to ensure on-going safety once the bully has been identified and cautioned

G. P.8 Acceptance of Responsibility

- recognise situations in which peers are being victimised and accept responsibility for securing assistance, discouraging the bully or reporting the incident
- understand the limitations of their responsibility to intervene
- call upon those in authority to accept responsibility for the safety of bullied peers
- refrain from discussing the problem with the identified bully, their representative, friend or relative other than through the formal processes devised for resolution of the problem

G. P. 9 Confidentiality and Ethical Processes

- respect the privacy and confidentiality of those involved in the procedure
- refrain from discussing the problem with the identified bully, their representative, friend or relative other than through the formal processes devised for resolution of the problem
- refrain from revealing the names or other details of their partner or the problem outside the advocacy process
- consider cultural issues and differences
- maintain trust through honesty
- resolve personal conflicts of interest to the benefit of the victim.
G. P.10 Commitment to Resolution

- *work towards a resolution of the abusive behaviour in a manner which guarantees the safety and security of victims and the acceptance of responsibility by bullies.
- *expedite the process of protective intervention through collaboration with the victim and those in authority
- *recognise the point at which advocacy has achieved all it can in the circumstances and allow resolution outside the advocacy process if necessary and requested.

**Operational Principles For Peer Advocacy**

These operational principles are meant to provide an ethical structure to the operational processes to be outlined further for Peer Advocacy. They are worded within the context of the program in such a way as to be comprehensible to students, and while the principles enshrined in the process are morally sophisticated, the acquisition of them is not beyond sensitive, committed and motivated young people.

Training for Peer Advocacy imparts the following principles for operating on behalf of and with those seeking help to resist bullying:

**O .P.1 Training /Certification:**

- students and others must participate in the specific Peer Advocacy training program (Healey, 2004) offered within the curriculum of the school in order to adopt the title of Peer Advocate
- students and others must demonstrate and document development of all the pre-requisite skills and knowledge of Peer Advocacy practice
- certification will be provided to participants in the Peer Advocacy training process to verify their successful acquisition of the required competencies
- while assistance may be offered informally at any time without training, those offering assistance as Peer Advocates must adhere to the certified practices taught during the training process to guide their advocacy activities.
- training will involve the content and practical applications described later in this document and devised exclusively for the Peer Advocacy program.

Figure 2 describes the content of the training program.
O. P.2 Availability/Accessibility

- Peer Advocates are available to their age peers or younger school mates to advocate on their behalf or with them for help in resisting bullying.
- They are voluntarily available during school time and can arrange to offer the advocacy service at other times within guidelines provided with the guidance and support of their trainer.
- Peer Advocates will be provided with a school-based email address to which requests for assistance may be lodged, and additional other avenues of confidential access may be devised to ensure privacy and security.
- Peer Advocates only advocate on behalf of one individual at a time until the matters raised are resolved.
- Locations and times that advocacy is offered will be notified within the school or institution and will provide safety, security and privacy for the discussion of the specific requirements of the individual seeking assistance.
- Peer Advocacy will be offered at times and in locations which will not interfere with class or school timetables and facilities access.
- Negotiation with the partner seeking assistance will be undertaken to determine the type and frequency of advocacy to be offered.
- Peer Advocates can refuse to advocate on behalf of an applicant if a conflict in terms of suitability, independence or compatibility is identified.

O. P.3 Responsible Practice:

- Peer Advocates demonstrate an acceptance of responsibility to be an advocate by:
  - being punctual in attendance at briefing, de-briefing and advocacy meetings
  - maintaining the appropriate documentation of dates, times and outcomes of all meetings
  - maintaining contact with and support for the partner until a resolution of the problem or until an alternative advocate is found.
- They will ensure the partner feels able to rely on their support and active participation until the problem is resolved by communicating in a prompt, responsive and informative manner with the partner regarding the progress of the advocacy and complaint.
- They will not behave in such a way as to jeopardise the successful resolution of the problem.
O. P.4 Confidentiality:

- Peer Advocates will not reveal the names or other details of their partner or the problem outside the advocacy process
- they will not discuss the problem raised by their partner, other than with the knowledge and approval of the partner and as a means of resolution
- they will not discuss the problem for which they currently act as advocate with individuals who are not concerned with the resolution of the problem
- they will keep all written /recorded notes related to the problem in a secure and private location to avoid breaches of confidentiality
- referral of candidates to the advocacy register or team will be accepted through self-nomination or nomination by others (parents, peers, community members, teachers) in confidence
- structures will be put in place to ensure access to Peer Advocates can be gained through secure and private means including a school-based email address
- Peer Advocates may discuss their experiences of advocacy in certain circumstances but must maintain the anonymity of any and all partners
- Peer Advocates may discuss their concerns and strategies with an adult mentor in order to secure support
- Peer Advocates may discuss their concerns or the issues involved with others when requested by the accessing peer.

O.P.5 Individualised Support

- Peer Advocates will consider each partner for whom they advocate over time to be an individual with particular needs and problems for which they require individual intervention
- each such individual will be given the opportunity to identify their specific needs to their advocate prior to the advocacy process commencing
- the applications of the processes and interventions will reflect a belief that the individual for whom advocacy is provided has the right to be identified as they choose during the advocacy process and this would include being identified as a victim, complainant or by name only.
• individuals referred for assistance may refuse to participate in the advocacy
• process or may choose the level of involvement suited to their individual needs
• consent of individuals who are victims of bullying is required before advocacy is undertaken on their behalf. However, consideration must be given to mandatory notification provisions concerning abuse and protection of children and young people.

O. P.6 Practice of Peer Advocacy:

• initially, middle and/or senior students will be inducted into the training program and will volunteer on completion and certification, to implement their advocacy skills to assist others
• those students who acquire the competencies and successfully complete the practical activities will be eligible to register as advocates
• students may decline to offer their services as advocates following training
• personal attributes of advocates including commitment, reliability, empathy and maturity as well as other indicators may be considered in decisions about inclusion in the advocacy register
• the school Peer Advocacy mentor reserves the right to refuse permission to advocate or to remove an Advocate from the register on the basis of misconduct which directly contradicts the principles and practices of Peer Advocacy.
• individuals seeking the assistance of an Advocate may select from three available and qualified Advocates or place a special request for a particular Advocate

O. P.7 Documentation and Monitoring

• the purpose of accurate recording of the complaint and a record of the procedures undertaken. A booklet of relevant forms and other documents is provided which can assist the victimised individual and the Peer Advocate to maintain a diary of the progress of the intervention.
• the process of documentation is a significant part of the operation of the program and must be maintained with accuracy and in a secure location for the period of the advocacy process.
• most documentation requires the signature of all participants to the discussions
• the documentation may be destroyed or archived as determined by the participants at the conclusion and resolution of the process
O .P.8 Resourcing and Supporting Peer Advocacy

- School communities which implement the Peer Advocacy program need to provide ongoing resourcing and support for the practice of Peer Advocacy through:
- teacher involvement and commitment as trainers, Advocate mentors, meeting leaders, access facilitators and recipients of relevant reports
- provision of facilities for the conduct of advocacy meetings such as a private office or classroom
- procedures devised to facilitate, encourage and respond appropriately to Peer Advocate or victim complaints regarding bullying including a commitment to the reporting mechanism, meeting guidelines, outcomes notification and follow-up procedures all of which provide for privacy;
- a reporting bulletin or procedure to keep parents and the school community informed about the processes of Peer Advocacy
- flexibility in timetabling including the possibility of staffing/supervision adaptations, variations to arrival and departure times, movement about the school and composition of classes to restrict access of bullies to victims
- maintain an Advocacy register of qualified Peer Advocates and their availability for consultation

O P. 9 Conduct of meetings

- meetings within the process of Peer Advocacy are arranged to suit the needs of the complainant primarily
- meetings must be notified to all parties and agreement on timing reached if possible
- where an agreed time cannot be arranged on three occasions, the meeting may proceed without key participants, in order to expedite intervention. This also ensures that those resistant to the process are unable to prevent or delay notification of the complaints unnecessarily
- the Peer Advocacy process does not provide for the participation of the identified bully in advocacy meetings.
- participants in Advocacy meetings under this program typically involve:
  - the complainant with the Advocate
  - parents of the complainant if desired by the complainant,
  - Principal, teacher or other representative personnel with the authority to implement or instruct intervention,
- meetings are strictly monitored in terms of time, frequency and documentation to ensure the process moves towards resolution as quickly and effectively as possible

O. P. 10 Participants in the Process

- complainants are individuals who have been exposed to bullying and who are seeking supportive and protective intervention to prevent further abuse
- Peer Advocates are trained school students to whom complainants appeal for representation and support in their quest for protection and intervention by those in authority
- Peer Advocacy mentors are teachers and others within the school community who have been trained in the processes and functions of Peer Advocacy and who offer adult support, direction and encouragement as needed within the process.
Processes and Procedures for Peer Advocacy

Figure 3 describes the process undertaken in the Peer Advocacy intervention.
Three types of advocacy intervention are proposed:

- initial-procedures are put in place to establish a supportive partnership until the advocacy needs are identified
- ongoing-continued involvement with the complainant to address the bullying problem
- crisis-immediate response to an event or episode causing distress

A series of structured meetings are held at the request of the complainant with a specific focus in each meeting. Guidelines for the conduct of meetings and the completion of the documentation is provided for the Peer Advocate in their training manual. The outcomes of each meeting are documented in forms (F1-F7) devised for the purpose of tracking the progress of the intervention. All such documentation is contained in the Peer Advocacy Record booklet provided for each complainant but retained by the Advocate. Each of the following processes is undertaken, according to a timetable which suits the complainant and/or the particular circumstances of the complaint. More urgent requests for intervention may expedite the process while less distressed complainants may require a slower application of the process.

Contact / Invocation of Process: duty Peer Advocate is contacted by the complainant by email or other means devised by the school, such as a postbox for written requests. There will be either a request for an interview or a detailed written complaint provided. In either case the complaint is documented

Assessment of Problem
Needs Analysis/Documentation: this involves identifying and recording the major complaint and secondary complaints and prioritising the concerns for intervention.
Selection of Procedures: there is a range of procedures (P1-P6) from which the complainant and the Advocate select to determine the level of intervention

P1. Peer Advocate advocates to bully
P2 Peer Advocate advocates to school
P3 Peer Advocate & complainant advocate to school
P4 Peer Advocate & complainant advocate to district
P5 Peer Advocate & complainant advocate to community organisation
P6 Peer Advocate & complainant advocate to legal representatives

Initially the Advocate, alone or with the complainant will approach the school authorities in structured and documented ways to secure support. The procedures necessarily become more stringent if the bullying continues without intervention.

Selection of Intervention: there is a range of intervention strategies from which to select (1.1 - 1.5) and the Peer Advocate and the complainant have access to all along a continuum of seriousness.

I.1 No further intervention
I.2 School implements protective intervention
I.3 District intervenes
I.4 Community organisation offers intervention
I.5 Legal intervention

While it is anticipated that the intervention of authorities in providing protection and support for the complainant will be forthcoming early in the Advocacy process this may not always be the case. Historically, victims of bullying have found it necessary to continue to seek assistance and intervention for prolonged periods before the victimisation is halted. This program structures the processes so that the Peer Advocate can direct the focus of the requests for assistance and determine when other avenues of help are needed.

Implementation and Monitoring
Review Outcomes
Review Processes
Closure and Resolution

The remaining components are documented and record progress towards resolution of the abusive interactions.
Summary

It is evident that the process of Peer Advocacy will require significant commitment on the part of the student advocates as well as the school. There is a need for a mentor or several mentors to be established within the school community to support the processes and procedures undertaken by the Peer Advocate. It is essential, however, that the major intervention is undertaken by the peer as the evidence is quite clear that it is the support or rejection by peers which ultimately determine the recovery of victims of peer abuse. While all students in the cohort are to be included in the training program, no student is required to undertake the role of Peer Advocate once the training is completed. The voluntary capacity of the advocate maintains the integrity and motivation of the individual in the role, and ensures their partners are given due consideration through choice.

It is important to note that at no stage in this program, although it is common in others, is the victim of bullying ever required to 'negotiate' with the bully. This program is premised on the understanding that such an approach to abusive relationships is inappropriate and further victimises the individual (Healey, in press). However, should the complainant decide to approach the bully on their own behalf to express their resistance, this would be supported and documented by the Advocate. Further, in Intervention 1 the Advocate may undertake the advocacy process on behalf of the victim with the bully and may well secure a resolution in this case. Similarly to other abusive situations however the likelihood of changing the behaviour of the abuser by simply requesting such a change is remote.

Finally it must be reiterated that such an intervention as is described here will in all probability not be effective if there is no other intervention for bullying in the school. The program fits with in a whole school comprehensive approach based on school data and which addresses staff attitudes and knowledge about bullying, structures within the school which may facilitate or support bullying, applied policy and individual interventions for those with very problematic behaviour.

The Peer Advocacy program will hopefully contribute to raised awareness, increased commitment to the protection of others and the development of an attitude which resists and confronts abusive behaviour throughout life.
Figure 1: Locating Peer Advocacy within the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Bullying in Schools

MACARTHUR MODEL for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Bullying in Schools

Component 1
baseline data of bullying in the school

Component 2
Analysis of baseline and in-service for staff and community re: bullying

Component 3
Policy development
Policy statements in support of Peer Advocacy

Component 4
Organisational restructuring: processes in place to support Peer Advocacy: reporting documentation staff representatives

Component 5
Curriculum for all students

Component 6
Individual Interventions
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* Introspection
* Tolerance

PEER ADVOCACY
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Phase 1 Apprentice
Phase 2 Deputy
Phase 3. Advocate
## PEER ADVOCACY PROGRAM

**Figure 2. Content of Training in the Peer Advocacy Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>APPRENTICE</td>
<td>DEPUTY PEER ADVOCATE</td>
<td>PEER ADVOCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEER ADVOCATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE &amp; SKILLS</td>
<td>ADVOCACY PROCESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 1</td>
<td>Introspection</td>
<td>6 Recognising Bullying</td>
<td>11 History &amp; Philosophy of Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 2</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>7 Help-Seeking (School Processes)</td>
<td>12 Types &amp; Styles of Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 3</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>8 Help-Seeking (System Processes)</td>
<td>13 Guiding Principles of Peer Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 4</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>9 Legislative Processes</td>
<td>14 Operational Principles of Peer Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 5</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>10 Community Processes</td>
<td>15 Procedures of Peer Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Structure of the Peer Advocacy Process
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Suspension Support for Children and Youth with Behaviour Problems

JEAN JENKIN

Presently in Australian educational systems there is no guarantee of a right to an education, but children must attend school compulsorily (Boer & Gleeson, 1982). This compulsion can be varied if in the opinion of the Minister, the child's behaviour is sufficiently difficult or disruptive as to cause concern for the safety of others and interference with education programs. Children can be expelled from school systems, thereby being denied access to any educational program since 1992 they can be 'excluded' from a particular school and must be placed elsewhere, or they can be suspended in which case their education is interrupted with consequent loss of skills. These children are deprived of appropriate peer contact, adult supervision and support. They may be considered to be better off educationally if they commit an offence such as stealing since this may result in them being placed in a detention centre generally giving them access to an educational program.

Since it is children with behaviour and learning difficulties who are most likely to suffer the consequence of suspension (Rose, 1988; Bain, 1988) the appropriateness of the procedure must be closely examined. If it is accepted that behavioural/emotional disorder is a disabling condition, present procedures must be viewed as exclusive and discriminatory as well as being unsound for the purposes of educational needs and behaviour management. The legal implications of excluding children with emotional or behavioural disorder are discussed by Bain (1988), but the legislation which protects such children in the United States, has not yet been enacted here. Even children who are educationally and psychologically diagnosed as having such a disorder and who are placed in segregated units in New South Wales can be excluded from their specialised programs by suspension from school. In other countries this is viewed as a non-negotiated review of placement and legal action is possible (Zantal-Weiner, 1988).

Children as young as 6 years can be excluded from school on the basis of their behaviour and it seems a denial of human rights and a travesty of educational philosophy to continue to address behaviour management, no matter the severity of the behaviour, with such a procedure.

Responsibility for suspension and expulsion of children with behaviour problems now rests with school principals, due to legislation changes in April 1991 to The Suspension and Expulsion Act (1985) and again in 1992. This however is a return full circle to the situation prior to June 1987, when this power was delegated to the minister following industrial action which resulted from an assault on a teacher. It is clear that the lack of consistency in handling such children and the repeated abrogations of responsibility results
in confusion about who is accountable for their education. The principles of a 'right to learn' and 'right to teach' must extend to all pupils and this will not happen unless someone takes responsibility for suitable academic and behavioural programming.

There can be no doubt about the rationale for implementing this strategy - it is meant to give children 'time out' to reflect upon their sins and come back to school repentant and apparently, fully educationally functional. Often the child has 'burnt out' a few fuses at school and suspension is seen as a period during which teachers can regroup and recover from the child's poor behaviour. It cannot be viewed as a legitimate 'time out' however, since this requires supervision, accurate recording and monitoring of the child's response to the strategy. Rather, suspension is a period during which the school completely withdraws from responsibility for the management of the child, and for educational programming. Usually no monitoring of the child's activities or behaviour during the suspension is conducted. Croll and Moses (1985) found that teachers view personality factors (31 per cent) and home influences (66 per cent) as being the major causes of problem behaviours and teacher or school factors as having an effect in only 2.5 per cent of cases. Teachers rarely view such behaviour as a reasonable response to inappropriate and inadequate teaching, despite the fact that this is often exactly what is happening. Hargreaves (1975) describes 'provocative behaviour' in teachers where sarcasm, embarrassment and humiliation are used to damage the student's self-image. Students inevitably respond to the failure and frustration with progressively more troublesome behaviours. These feelings accumulate over a number of years and are compounded by frequent disruptions to their educational programs delivery when suspension is implemented.

A further consideration in the application of suspension procedures is the suddenness with which they can be applied. The 'whim' concept is reinforced when immediate suspensions for minor misdemeanours are implemented, and it is for this reason that the pre-suspension support component is included in the Suspension Support Program. Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that an immediate response is necessary when weapons, drugs or other banned articles are discovered and the impact of this use of suspension recommends its retention. Until community and parental consultation can be established, it may well be appropriate to remove the student and the offensive article from school. Delays in investigation should be avoided however and an appropriate program provided.

In a busy school where teachers are overstretched with extra-curricular duties and obligations, it is very difficult to suggest an additional set of procedures requiring teacher involvement. However, if inappropriate behaviours are evident in the school environment, consideration may need to be given to a shift in emphasis in the selection and delivery of programs. Teachers who need to manage difficult students' behaviour should not be made to feel guilty if academic activities are given a reduced priority in some circumstances. Indeed, it is unlikely that such students will participate in carefully planned lessons when their needs are for social skills and behavioural training. This shift in content emphasis should be endorsed and supported by school administration, and the establishment of supportive
programs given priority. This unfortunately may mean a commitment by all staff to such unpleasant arrangements as additional supervision, re-allocated funds and resources re-deployment of personnel and withdrawal from more attractive pursuits such as competitive sports and excursions.

ALTERNATIVE INTERVENTIONS

Policy Development and Augmentation

Recent discussions with high school and primary school principals have led to some surprising revelations:
- children are suspended for such violations as uniform and homework refusal
- students have been subjected to attacks by gangs of youths entering the school grounds during recess periods
- the conduct of students at public transport locations became the focus of media attention following a stabbing after-school hours.

These incidents point to the need for schools to delineate categorically the parameters of their responsibility and to respond appropriately. This view was submitted to the recent Federal Inquiry into Violence in Schools along with the following definition:

Violence in schools refers to violent, assaultive or aggressive acts resulting from the interaction of teachers, students or school community members with each other, or with school property, and which occurs within normally accepted school hours and within normally accepted school boundaries and situations” (Jenkin, 1993)

It is clear that unless schools publicly state the level of responsibility they are prepared to adopt in managing student behaviour the community will continue to expect that periods of time immediately before or following school hours will be appropriately supervised.

Further, it is suggested that if schools concentrate on the stated defined parameters which cover responsibilities within the framework of 'school' hours and activities, then the community can be readily held responsible for inappropriate action outside these parameters. The importance of home-school collaboration in establishing and maintaining appropriate behaviour has been discussed (Christenson 1992), but the generalisation of behaviours successfully developed in school settings to the less structured home setting is an ongoing problem.

This concept of definition and recording of specific responsibilities has been used at the level of 'moral development' and rule-making practices at schools for some time, where lists of rights and responsibilities are notified. However, the vague and unempirical terminology used informs neither student nor parent nor teacher regarding the precise behaviour desired and the specific responsibilities accorded. It certainly is the 'right' of every student to be 'respected' and a responsibility for the student to 'respect' others - but if no guidelines are provided, no teaching and discussion of 'respectful' behaviour undertaken this type of statement becomes a platitude. It is essential that schools developing their own policies for management of difficult behaviour do so in terms of pragmatic, measurable and observable
behaviours which can be identified - in terms of 'respect' for example, tone of voice, use of language, demands made and compliance evident could be measures of 'respect', and would need to be identified. In New South Wales the development of a broad welfare and discipline policy for each school goes some way to establishing an appropriate framework for expectations. Self-appraisal of such policies to maintain and facilitate adequate behaviour management (Foundation for Educational Administration 1982) is systematically undertaken in schools overseas. In addition, effective reporting of incidents and detailed records facilitate analyses of intervention needs (Brodinsky, 1981; Jenkin, 1993). Student 'disengagement' can be cited as a factor leading to disruptive behaviour and often, ultimately, suspension. Strategies which attempt to utilise suspension as a remedial opportunity must incorporate effective academic programming as well as treating behavioural and personal characteristics.

Responsive and Preventative Programs

A comprehensive discussion of the program options to be considered when developing school policy to reduce suspensions has been reported (Jenkin, 1993). Fundamentally, it is apparent that a well-prepared teacher force supported by flexible and realistic executive and an informed parent community are much more likely to manage behaviour difficulties effectively. It is the commitment to developing such a coalition which takes time and effort. Too often, however, school communities - and indeed the community at large - demand approaches which they believe restore 'law and order'. The externally imposed control mechanisms usually cited - indicated most recently by the suggestion of 'boot camps' for young offenders - rely for their effectiveness on the very behaviours we seek to reduce - bullying, defiance, aggression and resistance. It is to be hoped that programs and strategies introduced to prevent behavioural difficulties and to respond to them will focus on the development of internal control through cognitive restructuring and attitude change. Basically, the use of suspension as an effective measure to 'punish' disruptive students is well past its 'use-by' date. Professionals responding to unmanageable behaviour need to take a long-term view through the implementation of educative programs.

MULTI-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO DIFFICULT BEHAVIOURS

A multiplicity of interventions have been devised to address the behaviour problems of young people, and many of these approaches are applicable during suspension support. However, care must be taken to avoid a fragmented and compartmentalised approach towards intervention - students may become multi-skilled but incapable of developing a cohesive response strategy in times of need. Certainly the aim is to broaden the repertoire of skills and behaviours which students generally choose in response to conflict, and a range of programs will permit such acquisition. Nevertheless, an holistic approach, which deals with cognitive, emotional and behavioural restructuring is more likely to serve the student into maturity. The programs
and approaches described in the literature currently are often exemplary with documented evaluation and sustained success in dealing with behaviour and interaction difficulties. One of the most impressive features of intervention overseas, particularly in America, is the range of professional groups involved, including judicial and legal professionals, health and medical practitioners, community based, charity and religious organisations, and mental health workers as well as educators. Young people with serious behaviour problems, social inadequacy, criminal orientations, drug and alcohol addictions and serious psychiatric and psychological disorders can access programs at various levels and through a range of professional contacts.

One such program, devised to introduce to students skills in negotiation modelled on international strategies, has been successful in assisting students to replace confrontational and aggressive behaviours with the verbal skills to 'negotiate' in conflict situations. Other curricular and training programs introduce conflict resolution, mediation, anger control, social skills, self esteem, assertiveness and many other interpersonal strategies to be used in the event of behaviour problems.

The Violence Prevention program (Prothrow-Stith 1989) was developed as a youth health initiative to inform and deflect youths involved in gang violence. It has been widely applied as a curriculum option in schools as well as hospitals dealing with the aftermath of gang conflict. The Second Step curriculum, developed for primary school children, takes a similar approach in dealing with interactive skills development for conflict resolution and child protection. The Institute for Mental Health Initiatives (Washington) takes a broader social approach by consulting with and instructing of media representatives in video production. They assist by developing appropriate psychological profiles with script writers so that images projected in videos more closely resemble real life and reality, as a way of informing young people. Numerous gang intervention and resistance programs have been developed for use by high schools in diverting young people - generally young males - from the criminal influences of gangs and these programs are often initiated by police precincts and legal professionals (see Appendix 1).

Many schools now have access to conflict resolution, mediation and social skills programs to assist youth and children to develop appropriate skills in communication. Many of these programs are suitable for adaptation to a suspension support strategy. It is clear, however, that such programs here are still seen as out of the mainstream of education, adjucrative and the first to be cancelled when there are time constraints and funds are tight.

Until teachers, school executive and parents accept that behaviour programming is an essential component of school attendance, those of us who are concerned for the welfare and success of troubled and troublesome students will be continually required to justify the time spent addressing behaviour issues. A major shift in teacher preparation, a professional approach to structuring policy and curricula for behaviour management and a major commitment from funding bodies to this need are all necessary if a more professional and responsible approach to suspension and exclusion is to be achieved.
SUSPENSION AS A REMEDIAL STRATEGY

An overview of the components of the *Coping with Violence in Schools* program (Jenkin & Bowie, 1993) will place the *Suspension Support* component within context. The program has been developed as a comprehensive approach to dealing with violent behaviours and attitudes in schools and has four parts:

1. **Intervention Strategies for School Personnel** examines interpersonal, organisational, environmental and professional skills and restructuring, towards a school culture which rejects violence.

2. **Structuring a Policy for a Non Violent School** leads a whole school community through the procedure of developing and recording a corporate statement delineating the parameters of school responsibility.

3. **ResolVE I** (Resolving Violence through Education) provides an anti-violence curriculum for secondary students.

4. **ResolVE II** provides a curriculum devised to teach alternative behaviours to students identified as potentially violent or with difficult behaviour. This program incorporates the *Suspension Support* strategy.

Having acknowledged the unpleasant truth that implementation of the proposed suspension support strategy will be costly to teachers, parents, administrators and students in terms of time and effort, some description of the origins and components is warranted.

The Macarthur *Suspension Support* Project was first implemented in South-West Regional Sydney schools in 1989 supported by a grant from University of Western Sydney. It was devised in response to a perceived gap in services for difficult students, and in the belief that such students required more, not less, teacher input when their behaviour, academic skills and self-esteem were in decline. Observation of the unrestricted and unsupervised antics suspendees engaged in during the period of suspension also reinforced the need for intervention. The program operated out of the University and offered academic, social skills, behavioural, and self-esteem programs. Collaboration with schools and sustained contact with students following reinstatement indicated that preventative and inclusive measures would be preferable to out of school suspension. The notion of pre-suspension support became obvious. The advantages of supervised in-school suspension in terms of monitoring and determining student activities also became apparent.

More recently, with the rise in community concern for violence intervention in schools, the strategy has been linked to the *ResolVE II Curriculum* (Jenkin, March 1994). It is evident that a systematic approach to the management of student time and attendance when they are not capable of being maintained in a regular classroom, is essential. Figure 1 describes the link between the curriculum and the strategy and indicates that the *ResolVE II* program can be delivered concurrently with any of the suspension options.
Figure 1 - ResolVE II curriculum can be incorporated into an stage of suspension support.

One of the key factors interfering with the acceptance and implementation of such a sensible philosophy is teacher attitude. To accept that students with behaviour and learning problems should receive more, not less, teacher attention is not easy. There is some resentment apparent based on the notion that students who are compliant and co-operative ought to receive far more attention and recognition for their appropriate behaviour, and students with behaviours which are inappropriate should receive less. The key here is publicity - it is certainly preferable that the co-operative student receive more public attention and recognition and that models for appropriate behaviour be found. Unfortunately it is usually the poorly behaved student who acquires notoriety. The program described here ensures greater privacy for the treatment of misdemeanours as well as segregated and individualised instruction in the requisite social, behavioural and academic skills. Students whose development in interpersonal skills, and socially appropriate behaviour is within the normal range should receive the same types of systematic reinforcement usually reserved for the structure of punishment regimes in schools. While the student body is thus engaged congratulating all successful members, the less successful can be addressed privately and intensively with remediation and instruction for specific needs. It is essential that schools adopt supportive structures for all members and this includes retaining the worst students, as well as the best within their walls. This is not a popular view. Nevertheless, it can be readily shown that teachers can develop superlative management skills, as evidenced by the success of educational programs in community care settings such as Minda, Reiby, Cobham in New South Wales. These most difficult students are managed and taught in segregated settings but the routines and procedures of successful regular classrooms are maintained. An in-school suspension program can be similarly successful when individualisation of programs is provided.
SUSPENSION SUPPORT STRATEGY INCORPORATING ResolVE II

The need of students for relevant academic, social skills and behavioural programs to address deficits in these areas can be met through the support structures established in the Suspension Support strategy, incorporating the ResolVE II curriculum (described in Appendix 1). The three levels are:

- Pre-suspension support;
- In-school suspension; and
- Suspension support.

Students can enter the program at any level but it is obviously preferable if early intervention can be implemented.

Level 1: Pre-suspension support

A pre-suspension support contract is recommended when student behaviour deteriorates and suspension seems imminent. It is a warning device applied systematically and purposefully and which puts students and parents on notice that changes are required. It also provides a supportive and supervised program clearly delineating behavioural and academic expectations for a given period.

Having identified the student as at risk of suspension due to violent, aggressive and resistant behaviour the school places him in the first level of support. The program comprises contracted participation in the following:

1.1 ResolVE II - skills development

1.2 Individualised education program;
  - analysis of basic skills (mis-match year 5 skills - year 8 program);
  - basic skills; and
  - support for mainstream curriculum.

1.3 Home-school liaison
  - parent interview;
  - contract; and
  - supervised home studies.

IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION AS AN ALTERNATIVE

An alternative to the 'suspension' or 'exclusion' strategy is to retain the child in school in an ‘in-school’ suspension program. This approach, while creating demands in terms of accommodation and staffing, nevertheless offers an ethical response to the problem of educational provision. It also serves as a more cost-effective measure than the establishment of segregated services for emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children.

In Great Britain, the growth of segregated units was quantified in a report by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (DES, 1978). They indicated that in 1970
only 18 units existed, a further 62 opened in 1974 and another 115 between 1975 and 1977. This may be interpreted as an indication of the increasing violence and disruptive behaviour of school children, but is more likely to reflect a greater inclination on the part of teachers, to defer children, and a less tolerant attitude towards behaviours identified as deviant or inappropriate.

Incidents for which suspension and exclusion can be applied vary internationally and regionally. The use of this strategy presupposes a clear definition and consistent interpretation by teachers and others. However, since personal and parochial interpretations differ so widely it becomes evident that the application of suspension is at best often instituted at the whim of momentarily insulted teachers. Little consistency is evident. In London the Board of Education decreed that children who bring matches and fireworks to school may be immediately suspended, whilst the Toronto Board specifies illicit drugs and alcohol and trafficking in same as 'activities warranting suspension' (Oppenheimer & Zigler 1988). In the Macarthur program it seems evident that recidivist suspendees while being suspended initially for more serious offences such as acts of violence, are subsequently re-suspended for less and less serious offences such as swearing. Again, the tolerance level of teachers seems to be the decisive factor in the procedure.

Hawkins (1988) in a study of recidivist suspendees found they 'differed noticeably from non-suspendees and students suspended only once'. Differences related to out-of-school activities involvement, special education needs, school performance and attendance levels. He also identified several suspendee 'types' - the fighter, student-in-crisis, truant, low achiever and episodic and concluded that prediction of suspension was possible based on information gathered about the child.

As an educationally and administratively efficient service, in-school suspension can offer a solution to the behaviour problems exhibited. Several underlying orientations have been described for the establishment of in-school suspension including:

- the academic model - the basic assumption is that behaviour problems stem from learning difficulties. In this model the individualised instruction program becomes the main focus;
- the therapeutic model - the approach focuses on internal problems the student is experiencing and takes a counselling orientation to deal with the problem behaviour; and
- the punitive model - this is the most popular interpretation and results from the belief that such children are simply trouble-makers and should be firmly dealt with.

Interventions related to suspension of students from mainstream programs have varying levels of success in re-establishing appropriate behaviours. 'Late and inappropriate intervention contributed to intervention failure' (Hawkes, 1988) and it is clear that differentiation of the procedure is warranted for different suspendee 'types'.

The implementation of in-school-suspension programs involves the consideration of a number of components such as the establishment of an in-school-suspension room, staffing, academic programming, criteria for selection of candidates, record keeping and follow-up (Foster, 1988). Further variations of in-school suspension include Saturday school, after school
hours programs, paid school jobs, and preventative measures (Leatt, 1988; Zantal-Weiner, 1988). It is clear that children for whom school is a miserable place and for whom compliant behaviour is difficult, may view suspension out of school as opportunity to avoid academic and social challenges. The procedure essentially gives them permission to select which teachers and which directives they will comply with, in the full knowledge that if they choose not to comply they will be rewarded with a brief respite from such demands - a few days at home! The concept also de-values education as it becomes clear to the child that education is readily sacrificed in favour of satisfying the teacher's need for respectful compliance. The program described here favours the therapeutic and remedial orientations for suspension from classroom attendance.

In-school suspension is a well-accepted, successfully conducted and appropriate response to behaviours for which exclusion from regular classrooms seems the only solution. It is apparent now, though, that a systematic and hierarchical approach to the practice of suspension is required. This permits intervention to varying degrees, satisfies teacher and parent expectations that inappropriate behaviours are dealt with yet provides the opportunity for remedial program delivery.

The suspension support program described here, and implemented at Macarthur, represents a comprehensive approach to the practice.

**Level 2: In-school suspension**

During an in-school suspension students are retained in the school but isolated from peers for the duration of the program. This program involves a commitment of time, staff and facilities and would necessitate some re-organisation of school resources to implement.

The in-school suspension is similar in length of time and purpose to out-of-school suspension, that is, time out from mainstream classes for 3-5 days but the key approach is remedial not punitive.

**Considerations**

- Location - a classroom, or smaller room needs to be allocated specifically for the program, it should be situated within the mainstream but should not be a room used for other purposes; access to all facilities must be available.
- Staffing - a staff member or a small team of committed staff need to be rostered to run the program. This may involve seeking funding for additional staff, re-deployment of staff, re-allocation of duties to cover this supervision, and so on.
- Program - students' mainstream program as well as the designated adjunctive programs will be delivered in the suspension room during the in-school suspension period.

Return to the mainstream following the in-school suspension period needs to be supported.
Level 3: Suspension support

Students for whom suspension out of school is deemed most appropriate should nevertheless be required, as a condition of re-entry, to complete a program of work prescribed individually, during the suspension period.

Delivery of the program can be arranged using in-school suspension support personnel, by accessing community organisations for assistance (for example, University of Western Sydney - SSP) and by requiring through home-school collaboration that parents involve themselves in the suspension.

Satisfactory completion of the program will provide a better prognosis for successful re-instatement.

CONCLUSION

The challenge for teachers and other professionals concerned with the delivery of relevant and effective programs for students with difficult behaviours, is primarily one of resourcing. There is no doubt that substantial increases to funding and personnel would be well-received by schools attempting to implement comprehensive programs in suspension support. However, it is possible to establish such a strategy with minimal costs, although staff and community commitment are essential. Rather than being an additional responsibility or set of duties, the program described here represents a deployment of staff more into structured responses.
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ABSTRACT

Victims of bullying or peer abuse do not form an homogeneous group and their capacities to resist the bully differ along a continuum from passivity and surrender to resilience and recovery. A descriptive model is presented which illustrates this phenomenon and discussion centres on the possibility of teaching resiliency skills to individuals who do not demonstrate a natural psychological capacity to recover from abuse. A selective analysis of the literature in relation to the concept of peer abuse as child abuse is explored as well as the notion that resistance to bullying is not simply an interpersonal skill, but that it resides within a social milieu which may well support the abuser. Consideration is also given to the effects of abuse on both resilient and non-resilient individuals to determine whether resilience provides protection from distress and the capacity to resist or avoid bullying. The model differentiates the characteristics of bullies, provocative victims and victims in relation to responsive behaviours and their outcomes. It depicts the progress of the victim along the coping and resistance continuum as a result of a specific program of intervention which includes resiliency training, and which is delivered within a supportive environment.
BULLYING AND RESILIENCY-A MODEL FOR INTERVENTION

JEAN B. HEALEY

Resilience is seen as an attribute which is measurable and quantitative and therefore clearly identifiable as a personality and behavioural trait in particular individuals. Kinard (1998) points out that the factors which define resilience are sometimes also reported as capacities which lead to the development of resilience. Having good self-regard, for example may indicate resilience is present or it may facilitate the establishment of resilient behaviour where none was previously demonstrated perhaps due to the absence of adversity. This becomes a critical matter in the discussion of responses to, and the impact of bullying. While some children may experience chronic life stressors such as poverty, incapacitated parents, maltreatment and school failure, others may be exposed to relatively short-term adversity such as bullying. The literature with regard to resilience more often refers to the former circumstance and the plethora of research and discussion on the subject is devoted mainly to the characteristics and indicators of resilience and analysis of the source of such competence given the negative outcomes of abuse which are generally consequent for the child. (Carver 1998; Wilson and Gottman, 1996,). Resiliency, on the other hand is the term used to describe the process of behaving with resilience in the event of adversity such as bullying (Healey 2002) The purpose of making the distinction between resilience and resiliency is to support the argument that behaviours indicative of resiliency can be taught and acquired, then utilised as a means of resisting bullying irrespective of whether the individual actually is resilient.
This discussion takes place in the context of an effort to establish the efficacy of a program of intervention for bullying which includes resiliency training. After establishing a context for the behaviour, a model for the teaching of this process is discussed.

Bullying as Abuse

The issue of whether bullying constitutes abuse is beginning to have some currency in the literature (Dawkins 1995; Healey, 2000; Kampulainen et al. 1998,) and indications are that the critical defining features of child maltreatment by adults are also applicable to peer abuse. Portwood (1999) explores the possibility of a consensual definition of child maltreatment by examining the diverse parameters offered by a range of professional groups involved in intervention with such children. Legal, health, education and community practitioners include descriptors such as harm or the threat of harm, intention of the perpetrator and negative outcomes for the abused individual as factors by which behaviours can be classified as abusive. While Duncan (1999) suggests that bullying is often viewed by society to be at the ‘milder end of the trauma spectrum’ and that it is viewed as ‘merely a bothersome part of a normal childhood’, this view cannot be sustained given that bullying behaviours clearly fit the parameters of other abusive actions on a number of dimensions including long and short term impact, psychological and physical harm, illegality and incidence (Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Rigby, 1996). Bullying is now being interpreted as a legislated child protection issue (Ambert 1995; Healey 2000) and mandatory reporting provisions are being seen as applicable to peer abuse. The categories of abuse which yield a diagnosis of psychological maltreatment include: “spurning, terrorizing, isolating, exploiting and
denying emotional responsiveness” (Hart & Brassard, 1991) and “the repetitive, sustained nature of the action (as) a crucial defining feature” (Kent & Waller, 1998).

Such descriptors are common in bullying episodes and there is little to differentiate adult/child abuse from peer abuse on these dimensions. The processes and outcomes are predictable, and well documented. Rigby (1994), indicates that the general health of self-reported victims of bullying is significantly poorer than that of non-victims with many psychological effects reported including lost sleep due to worry, constant strain and feeling worthless. Victims of bullying have been reported to exhibit higher rates of depression (Duncan, 1999; Neary and Joseph, 1994), withdrawal and suicidal thoughts in response to the abuse (Rigby 1994.; Prewitt 1988), and to experience emotional disturbances such as anxiety, panic, loneliness and rejection. Others report that victims feel humiliated, ashamed and degraded by the rejection they endure (Besag, 1989, Olweus, 1993) and develop introverted and socially avoidant behaviour (Slee, 1995). Furthermore there is evidence of long-term impact and the potential for difficulties in interpersonal relationships in adult life as a result of bullying in childhood (Doll & Lyon 1998). Duncan (1999) describes a retrospective study in which 46% of college students reported frequent flashbacks to childhood bullying even as young adults, while Matsui, Kakuyama, Tsuzuki, and Onglatco (1996) found continued depression and low self esteem in Japanese males victimised as children. Bullying increases the likelihood of psychiatric referral and is correlated with clinical psychological disturbance.
(Kumpulainen et al 1998). Other researchers refer to the reinforcement of self concept for bullies as an outcome of their behaviour at the expense of the self regard of their victims (Marsh, Parada, Yeung & Healey 2001).

The literature discussing resilience in relation to abuse can therefore equally be applied to discussions of the development of resilience in response to bullying.

The capacity for young people to survive abuse through the acquisition of resilient behaviour is applicable to the experience of abuse at the hands of peers, just as much as to that experienced from adult abusers.

It is also pertinent to explore issues of fighting, play and conflict as they relate to bullying and resiliency. Fundamentally, bullying is readily distinguished from these types of interactions by the lack of reciprocity between participants. In fighting, two antagonists engage in often physical aggressive interactions in order to establish dominance of one over the other and both participants are psychologically focussed on resisting the dominance of the other while establishing their own status. Similarly with conflict situations two or more individuals have opposing desires and conflict arises when each party attempts to assert their wishes at the cost of the others’. Conversely in a ‘play’ situation the participants are mutually enjoying a shared activity to which all have consented. It can be readily seen therefore that none of these explanations adequately describe the interactions of the bully and victim primarily because of the lack of reciprocity. Even though bullies will often describe their behaviour as ‘play’ and ‘fighting’, astute observers, in particular teachers, should be able to differentiate the unhappy and resistant demeanour of the victim from the triumphant behaviour of the bully. A key factor here is to know the characteristics of the participants well enough to
be able to determine the likelihood that a normally passive, co-operative and compliant student is likely to be engaged in aggressive behaviours. Accounts of bullying are often described by teachers and other witnesses as ‘fights’ when clearly there is usually one person left significantly worse off than the others to the point of hospitalisation at times (Healey, 2001c).

Despite the fact that the altercation is between well-known aggressive individuals and equally well-known non-aggressive individuals adults responsible for managing such situations fail to interpret the interaction as bullying. There is evidence therefore that teachers must be professionally prepared to enable them to utilise their intimate knowledge of the participants to make more reasonable assessments of the aggressive interaction witnessed (O.Moore, 2000). They should then be able to confidently dispute the description of the event as ‘play’ or ‘fighting’ when clearly one individual is more recipient than participant.

Effects of Bullying

A continuing theme in society is that bullying somehow assists the growth of ‘character’, ‘manliness’ and resilience. This notion is usually only applied to bullying of vulnerable children and young people, however, and it is rarely suggested that adults could benefit in the same way from bullying in their personal or work relationships. It is important to consider that irrespective of the degree of resiliency demonstrated by the victim, the emotional impact of bullying is likely to remain substantial. Resilient behaviours are demonstrated despite the distress experienced not as an alternative response to it. Some individuals will couple the emotional pain with overtly effective behavioural responses
(resiliency) while others will respond in an ineffective, non-resilient manner along with the distress. The level of resilience evident in the overt behaviours does not indicate the level of emotional impact and this is a critical factor in intervention in bullying.

Victims of bullying who respond in a more pro-active and self-protective manner should not be viewed as less damaged than those who are incapable of demonstrating effective help-seeking responses. Resilient behaviours do not preclude emotional damage and depression (Luthar, 1997; Spaccarelli & Kim, 1995), and the danger is that apparently resilient individuals will be less well supported and indeed may be excluded from, or denied intervention to halt the abuse on the basis of their more competent social responses. This can increase the emotional impact and lead to re-victimisation through the withholding of support and intervention.

However, while it is commonly assumed that traumatic events such as psychological or physical abuse inevitably result in psychological harm, some researchers see the need to challenge this in the light of evidence of resilience (Monaghan-Blout, 1997). The concept of suffering in order to grow—a popularly expressed view in community and school discussions of bullying intervention—needs some refinement if young people are to be protected from bullying and other forms of abuse. Cohen, Cimbolic, Armeli, & Hettler, (1998) discuss this controversial aspect of resilience—that of ‘stress related growth’ or ‘post-traumatic growth’ and the concept of ‘benefit’ as a result of trauma, but care must be taken to determine whether and under what circumstances such positive outcomes can be expected. For young
people who are not resilient, that is, who do not have the capacity to recover spontaneously from adverse experiences, the notion that exposure to physical and emotional abuse whether through bullying or another source, somehow has the potential for a positive outcome, is clearly questionable.

The literature is replete with research which indicates that repeated exposure to maltreatment results in negative psychological and social outcomes for most individuals. (Besag, 1994; Spatz-Widom 1995; Strang 1995.)

Factors related to the development of resiliency

There is some discussion in the literature of the notion of protective factors residing within individuals who respond in a more resilient fashion to abusive situations and these include intellect (Carver, 1998), perceived social support (Byrne 1993), and effective social skills (Doll & Lyon, 1998). Nevertheless, we can assume that the abusive behaviour is just as damaging to these individuals but that they have developed overt responses which offer psychological buffers rather than passive responses which expose them to further incidents of abuse. This is relevant to intervention in that the emotional responses of the victim must be a paramount consideration and be fully understood and accepted if the victim is to be successful in establishing more effective and assertive responses.

Consideration also needs to be given to the perception of abuse or adversity held by the ‘victim’, and correspondingly to the evidence of resiliency observed. If the
'victim 'does not perceive the situation or event to be adverse or abusive, can their responses be described as resilient and coping? In the popular literature individuals are frequently described as resilient and as 'overcoming adversity' if, for example, they are successful despite disability. Caution needs to be exercised in this regard since although there can be no question that to succeed despite a disability is to achieve, unless the disability is perceived as an obstacle by the individual there is nothing to overcome. These individuals focus upon their capacities and the development of their skills to the same extent that non-disabled individuals do, and in the process become successful. We cannot assume that their efforts are based on a determination to overcome adversity if their circumstances are natural for them. Successful disabled athletes need to be as resilient in the face of defeat as successful non-disabled athletes, but their response is related to their perception of their capacity to perform, not their incapacity to do so.

Self-concept is a multi-dimensional attribute (Marsh, Parada, Yeung & Healey 2001) and is seen as a critical factor in the development of resilience (Cowen, et al 1997; Hart, & Brassard, 1997; Rouse, Ingersoll, & Orr, 1998,) as well as being an outcome of resilient responses to adverse situations. Positive self-concept can mediate risk-taking and provide a foundation for the persistent help-seeking behaviour which victimisation demands. Having positive self concept cannot necessarily protect the victim from the harmful effects of the bullying but may facilitate more assertive responses initially. Victimisation is not necessarily a function of the self-esteem of the victim since individuals having moderate to good self-esteem can nevertheless become the targets of bullies. Indeed, because of the multi-dimensional nature of the concept victims may continue to succeed in academic, physical and social functioning while their self-concept in peer relationships may decline as a result of the bullying.
Victims of bullying, whether they have high self regard or not, rely for assistance on those with authority to whom they turn, and given the high social status bullies often enjoy (Rigby, 1999) it is not always possible for victims to rally the support they need to protect them from the bully. Resiliency in this case provides the capacity to continue to seek help in the face of such indifference or rejection.

It is also important to differentiate factors associated with resilience from actual resilient behaviours in an attempt to adapt resiliency to bullying intervention. If we accept that certain factors correlate with resilience in individuals who have been thus identified—factors such as higher IQ, self-esteem, school performance and social competence (Kinard, 1998) we may be reluctant to include young people who do not have these attributes, in our efforts to develop resilient behaviours. While it may be easier to teach resilient behaviours such as help-seeking and assertiveness to individuals who have higher IQ’s, self-regard and social functioning, it is important that the skills be also introduced to victims who do not have the attributes as it is possible that some of these may ensue following resiliency training. Differentiating the key factors correlating with resilience from the behaviours indicative of resiliency is a critical factor in effective intervention.

The terms resiliency and thriving are often used interchangeably but can be differentiated essentially on the basis that thriving can develop in the absence of adversity, while resiliency is only identified in terms of adverse experiences. (Cohen, Cimbovic, Armeli, & Hettler, 1998). Unless or until the individual is placed under stress, the competencies of resiliency are not required.
However, thriving is often a continuous process illustrating a relatively uninterrupted life course leading to social and emotional competency. For victims of bullying it may be that developmental thriving will facilitate resiliency development if none has previously been demonstrated. Some of the key characteristics identified by Carver (1998) as indicative of thriving include several personal capacities such as decreased reactivity to stressful events, faster recovery from stress, optimism and confidence, as well as social indicators like consistently high social functioning and security in interpersonal relationships. Other researchers also identify personal characteristics related to thriving as potential mechanisms through which resiliency may be developed. Park (1998) describes stress-related growth as ‘mediated by various appraisal and coping processes’. The concept that stress can, in fact result in social or emotional growth is challenging but certainly encouraging in the issue of bullying. The argument here is that the experience of stress and the responses developed to deal with stress may result in emotional and psychological maturation, which is not the same argument used when it is suggested that exposure to abuse is beneficial. Exposure to manageable levels of stress during which coping mechanisms can be learned, may well be a valuable growth experience, but this cannot be equated to the overwhelmingly damaging results of exposure to abuse. An internal locus of control and well developed friendships also appear to be indicative of the characteristics which pre-dispose individuals to resiliency (Hart & Brassard, 1991), as does interpersonal attachment generally (Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990). Cognitive processes which contribute to the capacity to recover from adversity are also considered by Wilson and Gottman (1996) and described in terms of ‘attentional focus’.
The capacity to mediate affect through shifts in attentional focus, they believe, are fundamental to emotional regulation, and subsequent social functioning. Can victims of bullying be taught to introspectively shift their focus from the emotional impact of the victimisation and employ cognitive processes to redirect their attention to the use of language and action to effectively resist or avoid the bully? These researchers refer to this ability as "self-soothing" and provide physiological evidence that this capacity can be developed even in young children. If so these skills may be taught and brought to consciousness for implementation in times of stress or adversity such as bullying.

It is suggested here that resilient behaviours which are taught through child protection educational programmes, such as reporting to accredited agencies, using assertive verbal statements, avoidance and escape strategies, can be equally effective in resisting bullying. Resilience is assumed in the overt resistant behaviours (resiliency) exhibited by the victim, even though the individual may not in fact have resilience to the experience. Therefore, if those overt behaviours can be isolated, taught and demonstrated we can produce individuals who behave with resiliency in the face of peer abuse even when psychological resilience may not be fully established. In effect, simulated resilience can be taught and exhibited in the absence of true resilience.

It must be stated, however, that the teaching of various assertiveness skills for victims of bullying will not develop resilience unless the skills are embedded within an environment which will respond to the assertive requests for protection of the victim.
In a recent case of victimisation in a NSW high school, a young man of homosexual orientation eventually appealed to the media for assistance when his persistent requests for help in preventing and alleviating bullying at school were not successful. This young man was both resilient and assertive yet these personal attributes within a non-supportive environment could not protect him from being bullied.

It is also suggested here that conflict resolution strategies are most inappropriate to use as a bullying intervention. Conflict resolution involves either soft or hard bargaining (Elton 1993) on points of negotiation. Fundamentally of course, negotiations cannot take place when the issues are non-negotiable such as the safety and well-being of an individual who is naturally resistant when another wishes to physically or psychologically torment them. This cannot be viewed as a conflict or a point of negotiation. Safety is non-negotiable. In conflict resolution, particularly the hard variety, the participants are adversaries with a goal of victory and each needs to moderate their needs to ensure a win/win result. In a bullying situation the victim simply does not wish to be involved in any part of the harmful interaction, much less seek to win a conflict. Further, it is quite unfair to place an individual who has been involuntarily included as a target of another's aggression in a situation whereby they are required to make concessions to the aggressor. Safety, as noted, is not negotiable. Aggressors are not entitled to negotiate gains or satisfactory outcomes, they simply need to have their inappropriate interaction notified, discouraged, remediated and possibly punished.
Figure 1: Development of resiliency following period of intervention in a supportive environment which facilitates guided development, practice and assimilation of effective resistant behaviours.
Model for Intervention

A comprehensive approach to intervention in bullying in schools has been described whereby several components including policy development, teacher in-servicing, whole school organisational change and generic anti-bullying or other anti-violence strategies, as well as individual interventions for bullies and victims are employed to reduce the likelihood of effective bullying (Jenkin, 1994). This model describes an individual intervention for victims as part of the comprehensive approach needed in schools.

The model has been devised to illustrate the outcomes of an intervention which takes account of the factors discussed so far and which is intended to assist in the development of effective resistance to bullying. It illustrates progress along a continuum towards effective and appropriate peer interaction behaviours for victims of bullying. There is a tendency to believe that victims are always weak and ineffectual individuals mercilessly tormented by dominant bullies. This perception needs to be challenged if effective interventions are to be developed. The capacities of victims cover a wide spectrum of behaviours some of which are less assertive and effective than others, but which cannot all be classified as passive. Some victims may enter the paradigm exhibiting passive and ineffective responses to their victimisation but others may exhibit appropriate resistance and resilience which is not supported in the environment. The purpose of the intervention is to enable victims to eventually normalise relations towards neutral co-existence as a peer of the bully. Friendship is too much to hope for and the victim is unlikely to be inclined to seek such a relationship with an abusive peer.
Figure 1 illustrates the gradual development of skills by the victim as an effective response to bullying. This follows the application of a research-based intervention program, delivered in an environment committed to bullying prevention through the provision of supports. It also describes the relative positions of the protagonists. At one end of the interaction continuum are those victims who are neither resilient nor assertive and who succumb to the harmful effects of the bullying virtually without any resistance. They do not have the social or interpersonal skills or confidence to resist the bully or seek help to stop the victimisation and they may well endure serious psychological and emotional damage as a result. These victims of bullying can truly be classified as passive victims, and the prognosis without remedial intervention is bleak. Such individuals, without the benefit of genuine resilience nor acquired resiliency behaviours are often abandoned by non-abusive peers who lack sympathy for or empathy with their plight. (Healey 2001: Rigby, 1996). Their complaints are frequently dismissed as insignificant by those in authority with the power to intervene. This is often due to a misinterpretation of the interactions observed or reported. Teachers frequently and inappropriately identify bullying as play or fighting and fail to intervene or offer support or protection. Victims therefore struggle to cope in such unsupportive environments. While it is certainly true that bullies select their targets using specific criteria including the likelihood that they will encounter little or no resistance, they are also aware that their behaviour may well be interpreted as something other than bullying by those to whom the victim turns. The attitudes and indifference of those within the social milieu of the victim contribute substantially to the reinforcement of bullying behaviour.
When victims of bullying demonstrate some defensive skills such as protestations to the bully, seeking peer support and early stage reporting behaviour (Healey 2001) they can be described as defensive victims. These individuals are further along the continuum of effectiveness in response to bullying and are beginning to develop a level of assertiveness. If, through the application of an instructional intervention they can be given the opportunity to practice such skills, their capacity for resistance will improve as will their determination to secure the support to which they are entitled. Victims of bullying who can be classified as defensive make stronger attempts to assert their desire to be left alone and to be assisted to avoid or prevent the bullying behaviour. These individuals require further training in effective skills of resistance such as reporting and self-advocacy, but can develop a foundation of assertiveness and some resiliency in continuing to resist the bully despite minimal support in the social milieu. It is at this juncture that the Peer Advocacy program described elsewhere (Healey, 1997) can be incorporated to offer a further level of assistance and support for victims.

The resistant victim whose resiliency has been developed through the program of intervention, and whose responses are therefore more effective, will have more success in diverting the bully and recovering from the victimisation. While receiving instructional intervention these skills are practised and reinforced to facilitate implementation in bullying situations. It must be remembered, however that the effectiveness of the victim is not simply a function of their skills, but a combination of their resistance within effective protective environments which have established codes for responding to complaints about bullying.
The **effective victim** will emerge when the period of intervention within such an environment leads to the assimilation of effective skills, more sustained assertive responses and ultimately resiliency. Victimisation may not cease but these victims will have acquired more effective strategies for coping. Normalisation of relationships between the bully and the victim will result in neutral co-habitation whereby each individual functions without inappropriate interactions. Avoidance of the bully, sustained resistance and resiliency will enable this to occur. The bully must also be involved in an individual intervention to normalise their behaviour towards appropriate peer interactions.

There is a final category of victim included in Figure 1 and placed separately from the passive-defensive-resistant-effective paradigm of victims who are genuinely enduring involuntary negative and harmful interactions with a bullying individual. The **provocative victim** cannot be placed on the same continuum as the latter victims since the behaviour in which provocative victims engage is similar to, though obviously less effective than, the aggressive behaviour of the bully. This individual is described as a ‘victim’ simply because the outcome of their provocative behaviour is negative for them, as opposed to the outcome of aggressive behaviour for the bully which is generally positive for them. We need to consider the provocative victim more as a failed bully than as a genuine victim. The behaviours of the provocative victim include name-calling, tormenting, interference and general nuisance-causing and often lead to negative physical consequences.
These individuals are not passive in the face of the responses they receive and promptly complain about their victimisation and hurt. (Rigby, 1996). Provocative victims are identified by vigilant teachers who observe the interactions provoked by their behaviours, and while assistance cannot be denied to these or any other individuals harmed by others, there is a different paradigm altogether in the relationship between the provocative and the passive victim and the bully. The essential difference between passive and provocative victims is the reciprocity of the behaviour—a key discriminating factor in identifying bullying. As discussed earlier, bullying is not play and it is not fighting, even though bullies often use these terms to justify their behaviours. The critical component of the bully-victim paradigm is the lack of reciprocity in the behaviour. This, of course is the defining factor in the provocative victim-bully paradigm whereby both participants are engaging in mutually harmful behaviours. This becomes an important factor when intervention is considered since provocative victims do not require instruction in the same skills as passive or resistant victims. Provocative victims engage in aggressive behaviour and need instruction in appropriate interaction behaviours just as bullies do, while passive victims need assistance to develop more resilient, less passive behaviours.

In terms of resiliency, then, bullying necessitates instruction in resistance and self-protective behaviours particularly for those individuals who do not exhibit natural resistance to the abuse. The model presented here indicates that victims of bullying may possess or develop varying degrees of resistance and coping strategies but are nevertheless victimised. For those individuals for whom resistance is difficult, and therefore for whom resiliency is also difficult to demonstrate, more intensive intervention over a longer period will be necessary.
In summary, some victims start from a stronger psychological point with some resistant and resilient behaviours already present, but who nevertheless need assistance to utilize these effectively within the relevant milieu to ensure bullying is discouraged. Importantly, it is clear that even individuals possessing assertiveness and resiliency skills developed prior to victimisation will still require instruction and support to ensure they persist through notification and help-seeking to resist the bully. Resiliency is not promoted here as an attribute which will prevent bullying or which can reduce the negative impact of bullying but as an appropriate response repertoire which can be learned and developed through specific intervention. Victims can learn to demonstrate resiliency by help-seeking and resistant behaviours but their success is predicated on the support received within the social environment in which it occurs.
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BACK IN THE PLAYGROUND BLUES
BY
ADRIAN MITCHELL 1985

Dreamed I was in a school playground, I was about four feet high.
Yes, I dreamed I was back in the playground
and standing about four feet high
The playground was three miles long
and the playground was five miles wide

It was broken black tarmac with a fence all around
Broken black dusty tarmac with a high fence running all around
And it had a special name to it; they called it The Killing Ground

Got a mother and a father, they're a thousand miles away
The Rulers of the Killing Ground are coming out to play
Everyone thinking, who they going to play with to-day?

You get it for being Jewish
Get it for being black
Get it for being chicken
Get it for fighting back
You get it for being big and fat
Get it for being small
Of those who get it get in and get in
For any coming thing at all

Sometimes they have a beetle, tear off its six legs one by one
Beetle on its black back rocking in the lunchtime sun
But a beetle can't beg for mercy, a beetle's not half the fun

Heard a deep voice talking, it had that loping sound:
"In preparations for life—out I never found
Any place in my life that's worse than The Killing Ground
WITH THANKS
TO ALL THE KIDS WHO HAVE SHARED THEIR WORST FEARS AND EXPERIENCES WITH ME.
IT'S TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE BUT IT MAY HELP THE NEXT GENERATION.
INTRODUCTION

BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
A MANUAL FOR A COMPREHENSIVE AND
CUSTOMISED APPROACH TO INTERVENTION
JEAN B. HEALEY

Bullying has been endemic in schools for decades and results in daily misery for many children and young people often over prolonged periods of time. Most students are safe and secure, nurtured and encouraged while at school, however the evidence is now overwhelming that for many this is not their experience on a daily basis. Schools are now required to do much more than in the past to intervene to support and protect victims from the behaviours of abusive peers. This manual has been produced to provide guidelines for a comprehensive intervention in bullying in schools, customised to the needs of the individual school. It includes instructions for gathering data about what is happening in your school; material for the presentation of an in-service program to inform teachers, administrative personnel and school community members; workshop modules to facilitate the development of policy and procedures and curricular interventions to prepare all students for the responsibility of intervening in bullying in schools. Schools and teachers have a particular responsibility to provide the support and guidance needed by victimised individuals and to establish reliable and effective procedures for their protection. This manual presents a comprehensive model for intervention based on extensive classroom and school experience and research in a range of educational institutions in Australia and overseas. The manual documents content, practices and processes for intervention which will ensure that schools can be seen as safe havens for learning in the future.

In deciding to adopt a comprehensive approach to intervention you have shown your commitment to this goal.

Congratulations and good luck
JEAN B. HEALEY
PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

In all likelihood you have volunteered to accept responsibility for addressing the bullying issue in your school, or have accepted it as a legitimate role of your position. You may well be in the process of deciding whether it is necessary or worthwhile to commit resources and time to this matter when there are so many other situations requiring your attention. Before you begin the process of intervention in bullying in your school, therefore, you need to be aware of a number of prerequisite conditions, resources and supports to ensure your success. These relate to the skills and attitudes of relevant personnel as well as organisational time and materials to support the intervention.

Firstly, you need to familiarise yourself with this manual thoroughly before you begin any aspect of intervention. You need to understand the purpose and relevance of each component of the intervention and the reasons for the placement of each component in the overall plan. The overview section will provide you with introductory details for each component. This will facilitate your eventual induction of other staff to the program.

Secondly, you need to defer discussion of the procedures and elements of the intervention except with a trusted colleague to begin with. This is because you will conduct a survey throughout the school and too much prior discussion on a general level with staff may lead to discussion in classrooms which in turn may interfere with the collection of data. Students should not be prepared in any way for the survey. Parents should be informed of the questionnaire either well in advance (‘we will conduct a survey some time this term’) or immediately prior (‘we will conduct a survey tomorrow’). It should not be necessary to seek parental permission for such an activity, but parents must be fully informed of, and if possible involved with all the procedures which follow.
Thirdly, you need to establish leadership positions for the various components of the intervention. You may recruit a senior member of staff to oversee the data collection process, another to conduct the in-service, another to organise the workshops etc. This ensures a broad base of commitment to the overall program. It will be your thorough understanding of the program which will ensure its success. Additionally, you may seek the support of the school counsellor and district support personnel provided by education authorities to facilitate behavioural interventions in schools.

As the program progresses, senior students would be expected to accept additional responsibilities, particularly given their training in Peer Advocacy within the school. Documentation of the processes and procedures undertaken should be formalised. A means of maintaining communication with the main stakeholders including students of course should be considered for example a bully bulletin news sheet at regular intervals to report on changes implemented and progress made.

It is evident from these preliminary considerations that there is an expectation of complete commitment to an anti-bullying culture within the school. This intervention requires long-term effort to ensure a change in the attitudes and behaviours of bullies and their targets as well as the general community of the school. No less a response will effect change. Finally, you need to ensure the resources and time are available to undertake the intervention over a prolonged period, possibly a whole year.

I wish you every success in this endeavor.
OVERVIEW OF THE INTERVENTION

This manual outlines an approach to be taken by schools which confronts bullies and bullying behaviour on many levels, and which facilitates the implementation of a comprehensive intervention across the whole school community. The approach acknowledges the origins and impact of bullying behaviour and identifies six key elements to intervention which challenge individuals, organizational structures and attitudes which facilitate the continuation of bullying in the school. The intervention has been discussed in the literature as the Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Bullying in Schools (Healey, 2003: Healey, 2004). The model is premised on sound pedagogical principles which prescribe a research-based and thorough approach to intervention. This also establishes the customised element as all decisions are made on the basis of the survey data which will indicate specific areas of need within the particular school. Research indicates that there are significant differences between schools in relation to types, frequency and intensity of incidents and parameters of bullying.

Figure 1 describes the six key components of the intervention and the chronology for implementation. Component 1 involves the conduct of a whole school survey and is undertaken before any other intervention is embarked upon. This is followed by Component 2 which involves a whole school in-service day at which major decisions are taken on the basis of the school data. The remaining four components are then undertaken over a more prolonged period of time to establish an anti-bullying culture within the school. Implementation of the intervention requires a good deal of commitment, energy and determination on the part of the school community. However the process is no more demanding of teachers' and administrators' time than a whole school performance in music or drama or sport would require. Schools are renowned for their contributions and achievements in these aspects of education and it is hoped that the anticipated positive outcomes of the efforts involved in implementing this intervention will encourage a similar level of commitment to overcoming bullying in the school. The procedures outlined here rely upon shared responsibilities and tasks and are manageable within the framework of whole school organisational structures and resources once the decision has been taken to proceed.
Figure 1: The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Bullying in Schools

**MACARTHUR MODEL** for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Bullying in Schools

- **Component 1**
  - Baseline data of bullying in the school

- **Component 2**
  - Analysis of baseline and in-service for staff and community re: bullying

- **Component 3**
  - Policy development

- **Component 4**
  - Organisational restructuring: processes put in place to support the intervention

- **Component 5**
  - Curriculum for all students

- **Component 6**
  - Individual Interventions

  - **PEER ADVOCACY**
    - Anti-bullying Curriculum for all students
    - Phase 1 Apprentice
    - Phase 2 Deputy
    - Phase 3. Advocate

  - **VICTIMS:**
    - Accessing Peer Advocacy
    - Assertiveness
    - Resiliency
    - Social Skills

  - **BULLIES:**
    - Awareness of Peer Advocacy process
    - Empathy
    - Responsibility
    - Introspection
    - Tolerance
GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

It is suggested that the program be implemented across two terms and maintained for the remainder of the year and beyond. This allows ample time for the collection and analysis of data and the formation of working groups to assist in the production of the policy, products and procedures devised during the workshops. It also allows time for an anti-bullying culture to develop and permeate the school.

For example:

**MID TERM 2: BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE MANUAL, PROGRAM AND PROCESS**
Following the decision being taken to implement the intervention, some time must be allowed for a nominated staff member to become familiar with the whole process and to begin to organise the time schedules and resources required. Having done this, the proposals below suggest realistic levels of involvement to complete the program:

**SECTION 1 OF MANUAL - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

**DISTRIBUTION, COLLATION AND ANALYSIS (APPROXIMATELY FOUR WEEKS)**

Follow the guidelines for distribution and collection and arrange for the shared responsibility for collation and analysis in preparation for the next term. Survey distribution and data collation could be undertaken in approximately four weeks but a longer time period would allow for greater flexibility and staff involvement.

**TERM 3**

Conduct one-day, whole school staff in-service presenting the materials provided in section 2 and 3 of the manual.

**SECTION 2 OF MANUAL - UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY**

**MORNING AND MIDDLE SESSIONS OF THE IN-SERVICE DAY**

The information and overhead transparencies provided will enable a competent staff member to introduce the concepts and issues currently discussed in relation to bullying generally in schools. This prepares participants with background knowledge to facilitate their interpretation of your school data. There will also be a preliminary presentation and explanation of the school results by several staff members in preparation for the workshops.
SECTION 2 OF MANUAL - UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY

MORNING AND MIDDLE SESSIONS OF THE IN-SERVICE DAY

The information provided on the appended CD will enable a competent staff member to introduce the concepts and issues currently discussed in relation to bullying generally in schools. This prepares participants with background knowledge to facilitate their interpretation of your school data. There will also be a preliminary presentation and explanation of the school results by several staff members in preparation for the workshops.

SECTION 3 OF MANUAL - WORKSHOPS TO CUSTOMISE THE INTERVENTION

AFTERNOON SESSION OF THE IN-SERVICE DAY

Ten workshops are provided with full details of the activities and anticipated outcomes for each working party. It is expected that there will be a total of approximately six members in each working party, made up of members of staff, community members and students. Workshops are based solely on the school data results. Their interpretation and group discussion in each workshop will result in the production of policy statements, suggested products and organisational procedures to be incorporated into the school's customised response. Guidelines are provided to facilitate discussion and the outcomes anticipated.

SECTION 4 OF MANUAL - CONSOLIDATION OF POLICY, PROCEDURES AND PRODUCTS ALLOW FOUR WEEKS

Over the following four weeks, three working parties will be formed to consolidate the combined output of the ten workshops into three specific areas:

*Working party 1: Combine and refine policy statements produced in each workshop into a whole school policy which is applicable to all school staff, students and community members. The policy statement will also record the new policy with regard to organisational structures and school and individual curricular interventions.

*Working party 2: Consolidate all changes suggested in workshops in relation to procedures, documentation and organisational structures within the school.

*Working party 3: Combine, refine and arrange production of all proposed products of the workshops including posters, information handbook, pamphlets and such.
SECTION 5 OF MANUAL - ANTI-BULLYING CURRICULAR INTERVENTIONS

ONGOING COMMITMENT THROUGHOUT REMAINDER OF THE YEAR AND FURTHER

Follow the guidelines in section 5 of the manual for incorporation of the curricular interventions for the whole school population over the remainder of the term. Schools may select the Peer Advocacy program outlined in this manual or from other anti-bullying programs available. The critical factor is the involvement of all students in an anti-bullying education program.

SECTION 6 OF MANUAL - INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTIONS

ONGOING COMMITMENT THROUGHOUT REMAINDER OF THE YEAR AND FURTHER

Follow the guidelines in section 6 of the manual for intervention with identified bullies and victims who require individual programs over the remainder of the term. The support of the school counsellor may be requested to assist in the application of selected programs to address the inappropriate or ineffectual behaviours of identified individuals.

This provides a brief summary of the six components and the level of commitment required to implement the procedure. Details of each component and the specific activities and resources necessary to conduct the program are provided in following sections.

As can be seen, the program may be introduced gradually over the period of two terms in order to ensure all staff and students are familiar with the processes and procedures and can contribute to the changes suggested on the basis of the data collected. The outlined implementation strategy covers all the components of the comprehensive approach and allows for the program to be customised to suit the needs of individual schools and communities. It is essential that the program be maintained thereafter, to establish an anti-bullying ethic within the school based on the identified problems and concerns of participants.
OVERVIEW OF COMPONENTS

DESCRIPTION OF SIX KEY COMPONENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION:

*COMPONENT 1:
DETERMINING THE NATURE AND PARAMETERS OF BULLYING IN THE SCHOOL

*COMPONENT 2
UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY

*COMPONENT 3
POLICY DEVELOPMENT BASED ON SCHOOL RESEARCH

*COMPONENT 4
ORGANISATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

*COMPONENT 5
ANTI-BULLYING CURRICULA FOR ALL STUDENTS

*COMPONENT 6
INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTIONS
DESCRIPTION OF THE
SIX KEY COMPONENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE
INTERVENTION IN SCHOOLS

COMPONENT 1: DETERMINING THE NATURE AND PARAMETERS OF BULLYING
IN YOUR SCHOOL

In order for intervention to be effective it must be grounded in evidence of incidences and intensity of bullying in the particular school, not on generally published statistical information. It is the unique circumstances of the specific location which will prescribe effective intervention. It is not sufficient to review the data from other schools or generally in the literature although this can be informative. The research of this author clearly indicates that there are significant differences between schools and types of schools in the incidence, intensity, focus and victims of bullying. Given the diverse cultural compositions of Australian schools, this factor alone indicates the need for individualised and customised intervention. This component instructs the school in a thorough but simple and informative methodology for gathering data about the bullying happening in the school. It also describes the simple data analysis procedures which will enable the school to prepare the data in understandable and readable format, for examination and discussion by the whole school staff and community and facilitate needs analysis. This method provides the framework for customised intervention based on the research-based reality of the situation in the specific school. Baseline data collection is the most fundamental element of this intervention in bullying. It identifies the key types, victims, perpetrators, locations and impact of bullying in your school. These may differ substantially from those of a neighbouring school so it is well worth the effort to gather the data.

The collection of this information is no more complex than collecting whole school data related to basic skills, reading competence or demographic statistics-it is a simple process facilitated by the provision of data recording forms specific to this program. The School Safety Survey questionnaire is appended (appendix 1) and instructions for distribution, collection and analysis are detailed in Section 1.
The data collection phase will probably require about four weeks of involvement for data analysis and collation by several staff members or interested and skilled community members. Simple data analysis procedures will enable the school to prepare the data for examination and discussion by the whole schools staff and community and student members and will facilitate needs analysis. This method provides the framework for customised research-based intervention for the specific location. A whole day in-service should then be planned for the next two sections which address the remaining four components of the program and establish a timeline for the completion of the implementation of the intervention.

COMPONENT 2: IN-SERVICE DAY

2.1: UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY: DEFINITIONS, TYPES, MYTHS

This component allows school personnel and others to become familiar with bullying in schools generally, and with current research and literature. Training should be available to all members of the staff and community members who wish to participate. Personnel at the school include teaching, executive and ancillary staff as well as parents, all of whom have some responsibility for recognising, understanding, reporting or otherwise intervening in bullying behaviours. Students representatives should also be included as far as possible, since the intervention relies on their co-operation. Training for the whole student population is undertaken in component 5 through curricular programs. During the first part of the in-service day a competent staff member or team will present the information provided in this program using the Powerpoint presentation included. The team may need to reduce the amount of input here in order to leave plenty of time for the presentation of school data. They may also have additional current research from their own reading to share. This enables participants to interpret the school data on the basis of current research when it is presented in this in-service for their analysis. It also assists in placing the data in the wider context so that the idiosyncratic nature of the school's results are better appreciated. Intervention is not predicated on general information. It is based on the results of the in-school data survey. However, knowledge of the current state of affairs in other schools is valuable for comparative analysis.
2.2 UNDERSTANDING BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL: REVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

Preliminary results of the school survey will be available for discussion at this point in the in-service day. There may be several staff involved in presenting the results of their specific section of the survey to the whole school. The appended results recording sheets will facilitate the presentation of data in comprehensible and meaningful manner so that participants can be informed about the salient features of the school which impact on student safety and feelings of security and trust, can be identified. This clarifies the major issues and concerns of students and their perceptions, experiences and attitudes towards bullies and bullying in the school. It also shows the level of trust in teachers' capacity and willingness to assist, and in school procedures for protection of students and may pinpoint specific problem areas such as bus travel as places where bullying is experienced. There is an opportunity here to lead the whole school community in a realisation of the seriousness of the problem and the necessity for intervention to address the specific problems identified at the school.

2.3 APPLICATION OF SCHOOL DATA IN WORKSHOPS

Each staff and community member is given the opportunity in the second part of the in-service day, to review relevant sections of the school data during the workshop session and to offer their suggestions for addressing the issues raised through policy, procedures and products. Workshops are organised to include a range of school community members - staff, parents and students. There are ten workshops, each of which deals with specific elements of the data collected. The ten workshop topics focus on verbal and physical bullying, teacher and student skills, environmental factors which may facilitate or hide bullying episodes, teacher and school intervention procedures such as supervision and reporting which can contribute to effective intervention. On the basis of the data presented the workshop groups are then asked to discuss the specific problems of the school. Full details of the processes for this component are given further in the manual. Fundamentally, the task in each workshops is to develop three contributions to whole school intervention development by completing a page recording team decisions related specifically to the focus of the workshop (for example: verbal bullying, environmental issues) for inclusion in the overall school intervention:
1. A policy statement to be included in the overall policy document. This statement must relate to the focus of the workshop. For example, a policy statement referring to the inappropriateness of verbal abuse and defining behaviours which will be classified as verbal abuse in this school.

2. A procedural or organisational change suggestion for addressing the issue of focus in the workshop. For example the procedure for teachers or students to employ when they encounter or witness verbal abuse; a means for documenting specific complaints about verbal abuse; suggested appropriate consequences for individuals engaging in verbal peer abuse.

3. A product or part of a product for distribution or display related to the focus of the workshop. For example a page or pages related to verbal abuse for inclusion in the school handbook; a poster designed to express the impact of verbal abuse, perhaps produced by students.

COMPONENT 3: POLICY DEVELOPMENT BASED ON RESEARCH AT THE SCHOOL

This provides a statement rationalising and formalising the overall approach within the school for rejection of bullying behaviours. It empowers all members of the school community to express their views and states the parameters of their responsibility. It should describe acceptable behaviours in all school community members and the expectation that all members will be supportive towards those in need. Designing a policy for a non-bullying school reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members, in that they are making a conscious decision to manage their environment in a positive way. It reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale and illustrates a philosophical commitment to equity by addressing the unequal power relationships between participants. If it specifies procedures, responsibilities and resources, it will facilitate the maintenance of the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of all parties. The statements provided by each team following the workshops will be combined into a whole-school statement of policy in the follow-up working parties after the in-service day. This ensures all participants feel included in the final policy development and feel a sense of ownership and responsibility including teachers, students, parents and other community members.
The policy should be designed to define relationships, acknowledge individual differences in ability, personal style and goals, and should state the training and support mechanisms which will ensure that all concerned have their legitimate needs met. Each of these will be addressed in the workshop sessions and the policy will become a composite of the views and determinations of participants in the process. While such a policy statement will clarify responsive procedures, the major thrust should be to record a practical and philosophical statement in relation to maintaining a safe and nurturing environment through the development of preventative attitudes, skills and knowledge.

In structuring the policy, the following key components should be considered:

A. Philosophical statement
B. School personnel, Student & Community Interactions and behaviours
C. Programmes, strategies and skills to be developed and applied
D. Resources

COMPONENT 4: ORGANISATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

This is the element which often requires the greatest commitment by any school community as there are often processes, procedures and situations identified in the needs analysis which warrant change and the importation of various resources. This element prescribes a customised approach as the need for change will depend upon the responses elicited from students in the questionnaire distributed at the particular school. The form that restructuring takes may relate to such issues as out-of-class supervision including traveling to and from school. The school may need to make a decision about the extent of supervision to be provided for bus travel or they decide that it is a community responsibility to ensure the safety of students outside school bounds and times. Playground and other locations may be identified as areas where additional supervision is required and this could involve changes to rosters etc.
COMPONENT 5: ANTI-BULLYING CURRICULA FOR ALL STUDENTS

These are still rarely available, but the key elements of such a program for the whole school student population include activities to assist in the development of effective responses to bullying behaviour, and an understanding of the origins, outcomes and alternatives to such behaviour. Linked to this program are others which can contribute to a positive atmosphere in the school, including the Resolving Violence curriculum (Jenkin, 1996) and the Peer Advocacy program (Healey, 2003) both of which provide the necessary skills and knowledge to assist students to develop anti-violence or anti-bullying attitudes, skills and behaviours. Other programs can be incorporated into the comprehensive approach providing they meet the criteria of providing the necessary skills and knowledge for participants in the generic curriculum element of the program. Some programs are not recommended as appropriate for bullying intervention and this includes dispute and conflict resolution approaches which tend to dilute the level of responsibility of the abusive peer or bully.

COMPONENT 6: INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTIONS

This means that for bullies and victims direct and remedial instruction can be provided to facilitate their acceptance and acquisition of more socially appropriate behaviours. For victims of bullying this means learning to be resilient and assertive as well as persisting in help-seeking behaviours to secure the protection they need: for bullies this means learning empathetic behaviours and attitudes and stopping aggressive and abusive interactions. It may be that inappropriate behaviours are halted by the participation of all students in the whole school curriculum, however should there be identified bullies and victims the need for individual and programs is prescribed. The application of these programs can be assisted by the school counsellor, special education teacher and other qualified and available staff and would involve individual teaching sessions for skills acquisition.
SUMMARY

Each of the six key components described here is essential to successful intervention in bullying in your school. To engage in only one or two selected components is to ignore the need for a comprehensive approach based on specific school needs. Following the survey to establish the true parameters of bullying within the school, and the whole school in-service day, the other components may be undertaken simultaneously over an extended period. This means that policy development can be refined while organisational structures are being reviewed and a curriculum selected and introduced to the students population. It also means that bullies and victims often identified in the survey, can also be offered individual interventions to address their inappropriate and ineffectual behaviours.

The comprehensive and customised approach includes a series of workshops to assist in the development of products including a school information booklet about bullying, a policy document for distribution to school community members and various information and procedural documents including reporting formats. The program thoroughly prepares the school for intervention in bullying and has the capacity to reduce the range and impact of bullying behaviour over time. The approach described within the following pages has been documented, discussed and trialed in many situations and provides a truly comprehensive approach to intervention in bullying in schools. It requires a real commitment on the part of a school community but the resultant culture of acceptance of difference, responsibility for others and genuine caring will have long term beneficial outcomes for the whole school.
IMPLEMENTING THE INTERVENTION IN YOUR SCHOOL
SECTION 1

SURVEY OF BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

1.1 SURVEY: INSTRUCTIONS FOR DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION

1.2 ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL SURVEY DATA
1.1 SURVEY: INSTRUCTIONS FOR DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION

Research-based evidence is the only acceptable foundation by which to make decisions about intervention in bullying in schools. In this comprehensive approach, evidence of bullying behaviours which are specific to the school and location undertaking the intervention is the most relevant and salient information by which to develop a customised response. Although section three of this handbook provides background information relating to bullying generally, an investigation of the true parameters of the problem within the specific environment is necessary to ensure an accurate and focused program of intervention. Data from other schools and locations is simply not applicable generally, given the variability of cultural, gender and age factors in individual schools throughout Australia. Overseas data may have very little relevance to our cultural milieu even though it makes interesting background reading. For this reason the customised approach is recommended.

The methodology for undertaking what may seem a daunting task of data collection and analysis is clearly outlined in this section. It is anticipated that given a committed school community willing to share the responsibility and effort for data analysis using the simple forms provided, the task will be more manageable, cumulatively valuable and thorough. It provides the basis for all decisions regarding policy and procedures development and for intervention with individuals involved in bullying situations. Data from the school can remain confidential, in particular the names of nominated students who may be bullying others or victims of bullying. Teachers have a mandated responsibility to protect children and young people while they are at school, and the parameters of this responsibility may well extend to protection from peer abuse as well as all other forms of abuse.

Following staff and community discussion undertaken to determine the school’s commitment to the comprehensive intervention (see section 1), the processes for the approach will be systematically applied. This would include securing parent and other relevant persons approval for the program. The process for implementation is described in a series of steps to facilitate delegation of responsibilities for data collection and analysis prior to the establishment of intervention. It is a very valuable exercise for as many staff as possible to be involved in the process of data entry. This familiarises staff with their local information in readiness for the next phase which involves understanding bullying and the process of devising relevant interventions for the location.
It is advisable for a senior or executive member of staff to co-ordinate the preparation, distribution and collection of the survey forms.

**STEP 1 Survey preparation:** The survey form is located in Appendix 1. The survey should be reproduced on A4 paper double-sided. It is useful if the forms are printed in a range of colours denoting the year level of students undertaking the survey. This way they can readily be allocated to staff responsible for particular year groups and also readily tracked for review and analysis. The forms should be prepared confidentially so that very few members of staff have access to the forms prior to distribution. This prevents teachers from inadvertently effecting the results by mentioning or specifically discussing with students issues and questions raised in the survey. Ideally only the senior staff member and the person undertaking the copying duties should be familiar with the form prior to the survey being completed. Envelopes labelled for classes or year groups should be prepared. The surveys should be counted according to the number needed for the group, placed in the envelopes and sealed. Staff conducting the survey should be advised to collect the envelopes immediately prior to the session in which they will be distributed to students. Students MUST NOT be advised beforehand that the survey will be conducted on a given day.

**STEP 2 Survey Distribution and Completion:** Staff need to make a decision about the most suitable time for the survey to be distributed. It is imperative that the survey be given to all students at the same time throughout the school. This is often possible during a roll-call period or other period when students from a given year group meet for home-room routines etc. In order to ensure the greatest possible opportunity for students to give unadulterated and truthful responses without the influence of information from others who may have already seen the survey, teachers must be encouraged to form a cohesive team to present the survey at one time. Students must be given the following information:
a.) The purpose for the form being collected. That is, to help prevent and address bullying in the school. These are the terms that should be used in explanation.
b.) Who will have access to the form, usually a limited number of personnel at the school. Forms are completed anonymously unless students choose to include their name, so students can feel free to be honest and open.
c.) Participation is voluntary so they can chose not to complete the form
d.) They must answer all sections as truthfully and in as much detail as possible. Complete forms in ink only.
e.) Students may not discuss the questions in the survey during the period of completion.
f.) All distributed forms must be collected. Forms will not be returned.
g.) Students will be advised of the outcomes of the survey in due course.
h.) Students should be advised of the services available to them should they wish to discuss any aspect of the survey form or their experiences of bullying.

Completion of the form should take approximately 20 minutes. Students have the opportunity to include comments and other written responses which can take time but which provide valuable insights into the issues and problems.

**STEP 3 Survey Collection:** Following completion of the survey, the forms are to be collected and returned to the envelope and resealed. It is useful for further processing if they can be separated at this point into male and females respondents. The teacher is then responsible for returning them to a central location prior to redistribution for analysis. Some arrangements should be made for the safe and secure storage of the forms until the next phase is undertaken. An alternative solution is to decide prior to distribution how the forms will be allocated for analysis and the staff members can then be responsible for handing over the forms to the designated colleague. There are likely to be large numbers of forms to co-ordinate and manage so forward planning and organisation assists the further handling of the forms.
1.2 ANALYSIS AND REVIEW OF DATA FROM SURVEY RESPONSES

Analysis of the survey responses can be efficiently undertaken using the attached forms and a system of delegation and shared responsibility. All staff will be interested in reading the students responses and the sharing of responsibility for data entry gives many the opportunity to review the results. The following is a guide only and staff may determine another process more suited to their requirements and resources. The data recording forms would be best copied onto A3 paper to facilitate recording of the various numerical values.

STEP 4. Assign a member of staff to be responsible for recording the relevant information for a year group of students. Collate all forms for the year level, count and record:

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING IN THE YEAR LEVEL
TOTAL NUMBER OF FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONDING IN YEAR LEVEL
TOTAL NUMBER OF MALE STUDENTS RESPONDING IN YEAR LEVEL

This information will be required frequently during the analysis so should be readily accessible. Each survey form can be allocated a code number for reference. This is useful when attempting to match responses to cultural groups and when particularly serious responses are included. While the student cannot be identified, attention can be given to the salient issues raised. Coding should relate to year level eg. 701 for the first survey in year 7 etc.

STEP 5. QUESTION 3 on the survey form requests students nominate their COUNTRY OF BIRTH. It also requests that students nominate the country of birth of their parents. This information is relevant in relation to questions about culturally based bullying. The COUNTRY OF BIRTH of parents should also be completed as this may indicate the motivation for bullying. For example, a student who is Australian born and records this on their survey form, but who reports racial bullying may be traced to parents of Asian origin. This may be the focus of the bullying and is relevant for intervention. Prior to collating this information each staff member should be given a copy of the list of countries which may be recorded by students as their country of birth. Given the extraordinary variety of cultural backgrounds in Australian schools this list may not cover all of those nominated in the responses. They do however provide a reasonable list of 10 broad categories into which to place students even if their nominated country is not listed. In exceptional circumstances it be necessary to add a new category for the particular population of the school.
DATA ENTRY PROCEDURES

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN (OPTIONAL TO RECORD AND ANALYSE THIS DATA)

FORM 3A: This form may be shared between staff members assigned to each year group. Each completes the data for their group. E.G. for year 7 the staff member will record the total number of students responding to the survey, in the first column. They will then count and record as a raw total and a %, the number of students in this year group who nominate their country of birth as any of the 16 listed Asian countries or others that fit this category. It is helpful to record the number 1 next to the student’s response on their survey form. This process is repeated until each student is allocated to a cultural category. Some categories may yield no students. This is quite a long process and may be a task to be shared between two staff members.

FORM 3B This form enables a cultural breakdown of male respondents by year group
FORM 3C This form enables a cultural breakdown of female respondents by year group.

TYPES OF BULLYING

STEP 6. FORM 4 QUESTION 4 TYPES AND INTENSITY OF BULLYING YEAR 7-12

This question asks students to nominate any bullying behaviours they have experienced AT THE SCHOOL and also the frequency (and therefore the intensity) of the behaviours. A separate form is provided for each year level.

6.1 Increase the size of the form by copying onto A3. Use the form to tally responses or tally on a separate sheet. No provision is made on the form for gender differentiation but this can be readily achieved by creating a separate form 4. for males and for females for each year level and tallying them separately.

6.2 You only need to record a tally of the total number of students reporting the behaviour at each level of intensity which indicates bullying, i.e., Level 5 (once or more per day) level 4 (most days) and level 3 (weekly).

Levels 1 (never) and 2 (occasionally) do not indicate bullying since by definition bullying involves repetition of the behaviour and therefore do not need to be recorded. The first column of data indicates how frequently the behaviour occurs. Students who are experiencing bullying once or more per day are obviously more intensively bullied than those experiencing bullying weekly. Students who are reporting bullying at level 5 or 4 or 3 (weekly) are designated as bullied individuals.
6.3 Total the number of students and also record as a % of the whole group. Expect between 10-15% of students to report the behaviour. A total of these respondents will provide the total number and % of students bullied by each of the types of behaviours listed. One staff member for each year group may be given the responsibility for recording this data or it could be shared by several. Analysis of this data provides the most salient evidence of bullying in the school. For example:

   Number and % of students bullied by name-calling in year 7
   Number and % of students bullied by being left out on purpose in year 9

This is the information which will guide your school intervention as it may become clear that particular behaviour are more prevalent in particular cohorts or gender groups. The forms provided assist in organising the information for discussion.

**STEP 7 FORM 5 QUESTION 5.** This question asks students to assess HOW SERIOUS A PROBLEM they would describe bullying and harassment at the school on a scale from 1 to 6 Form 5 provides descriptive terms for each of the 6 designated levels of seriousness to facilitate discussion:

1 = not a problem, 2 = minor problem, 3 = moderate problem,
4 = serious problem
5 = severe problem, 6 = major problem

Each year group allocated staff member should count the number and calculate the % of students selecting each level and record this on the form.

**STEP 8 FORM 6B QUESTION 6B WOULD YOU REPORT TO A TEACHER?**

Question 6 has several components most of which require written or qualitative responses. These need to be analysed separately so no forms are provided.

Record responses to 6a (what would you suggest if a friend told you they were being bullied?) by tallying typical responses from students, which often fall into a small number of categories (e.g. tell a parent, tell the year advisor etc.). An overview of student attitudes is sufficient to report at the in-service day. An important factor is to determine student perceptions of reasonable and helpful responses to bullying and to refer aggressive or inappropriate responses to be addressed in the curricular intervention. Responses to 6c (who gets bullied at this school?) and 6d (who is a bully at this school?) are important indicators of student attitudes towards bullies and victims. The results are often surprising in that they record favourable descriptors of bullies and highly unfavourable descriptors of victims.
They often name individuals who are bullying others and also those being bullied. This information cannot be ignored and should be noted for immediate observation and intervention if necessary. Teachers are very rarely named as bullies, but are sometimes named as victims of bullying. The information is relevant to intervention as students express their views here about the willingness and capacity of teachers to assist those being bullied.

Part 6B responses are recorded on the form provided. This part requires a single response which can be recorded and analysed for the whole population of the year or for males or for females on the form. The information clarifies students' attitudes to reporting and is critical data for intervention.

**STEP 9 FORM 7 QUESTION 7 DOES THIS SCHOOL MAKE STUDENTS FEEL GOOD ABOUT THEMSELVES?**

Students can respond on a scale of 1 to 4 regarding the impact of the school on student self-regard. The designations are: 1 = very few feel good, 2 = some feel good, 3 = most feel good, 4 = all feel good.

The form permits recording of responses for the whole year group as well as males and females separately for each year level. Again it is suggested that the form be shared amongst all year level staff undertaking the analyses or have each record the responses on a separate form and then collate the overall results.

**STEP 10 FORM 8 QUESTION 8 WOULD YOU HELP SOMEONE YOU SAW BEING BULLIED?**

This question is answered using ‘yes’ and ‘no’ responses but students so frequently add ‘maybe’ or ‘depends’ prior to their comments this category has been included for recording purposes. This question by asking how? And why not? often reveals how confused students are with regard to recognising bullying. They often interpret bullying as fighting and reciprocal conflict which is an incorrect interpretation of the interaction. It nevertheless influences their responses as they indicate the victim should deal with it themselves. They also reveal a well-grounded fear that they may become targets for bullying should they offer assistance. Most of the information is anecdotal and needs to be interpreted using content analysis a means of categorising the responses. This can be done by identifying the key responses and anecdotal reporting of student views identified from the survey response forms.

The form permits recording of the whole year group as well as males and females by year group.
STEP 11 QUESTION 9 Record student comments and suggestions by year level and/or gender to identify similarities and differences in student perceptions about the most appropriate interventions and programs to address bullying in the school. Don’t be too surprised by the punitive attitudes often expressed in this question as students seem to believe that strict punitive consequences will effectively prevent bullying. They often also express the belief that victims should be taught to ‘stick up for themselves’ which approach should be addressed in the individual interventions component.

STEP 12 FORM 10 QUESTION 10.1-10.11 AREAS OF THE SCHOOL WHERE STUDENTS FEEL UNSAFE?
There are 11 nominated spaces where students may feel unsafe and the opportunity to list others should the respondent require to do so. Students are asked to identify unsafe areas by placing a cross beside the nominated location. This means that only those selected need be recorded on the data form once tallied. The form allows a tally and a recording of the number and % of students in each year group who nominated the location as unsafe. This is obviously vital information for the establishment of organisational structures to provide security, and the level of supervision necessary to ensure all students feel safe. Schools vary significantly in regard to student supervision and there may well be areas identified by students which require increased supervision or the introduction of supervision where none was previously provided. This has implications for timetabling and will be discussed and determined during the in-service day workshops.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS
Having collated this substantial data base of the parameters of bullying in your school you will be thoroughly aware of the need for intervention. It is now important to prepare the data for general discussion on the in-service day. It is suggested that some basic graphs and overheads be made to make the data available to the general school population for discussion during the in-service day. Further, it is useful to have photocopies of the relevant data sheets and/or graphs for use by the teams during the workshop sessions. Details of which data is required for each workshop are provided in the workshop outlines. Suggestions for the presentation of data for whole school review and discussion follow.
SECTION 2
IN-SERVICE DAY

SEE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION CD INCLUDED

2.1 UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: INFORMATION FOR
     SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY

* BACKGROUND TO BULLYING

* DEFINITIONS

* TYPES, MYTHS

* CURRENT RESEARCH

2.2 UNDERSTANDING BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL:
     REVIEW OF DATA FROM SCHOOL SURVEY
     RESPONSES
2.1 UNDERSTANDING BULLYING: INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY  
(SEE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION CD INCLUDED)

The school in-service day information is presented on the appended CD. Allow 3 hours.

2.2 REVIEW OF DATA FROM SCHOOL SURVEY RESPONSES AND PRELIMINARY NEEDS ANALYSIS

Review by year level using overheads or other graphic means:
The total number of students responding, their gender proportions and the percent-
age bullied in each year level and overall should be presented

1. QUESTION 3 (optional )

Year 7 demographics re: country of birth of students and/or parents
Year 8 demographics re: country of birth of students and/or parents etc for each year level or one staff member may present all of the demographic details for all year groups.

2. QUESTION 4 TYPES AND FREQUENCY OF BULLYING

2.1 Year level results for the types and frequency of bullying behaviours
2.2 Gender results for the types and frequency of bullying behaviours
2.3 Country of Birth results for the types and frequency of bullying behaviours (optional)

3. QUESTION 5 HOW BIG A PROBLEM IS BULLYING IN THIS SCHOOL?

3.1 Responses for all students
3.2 Responses for bullied students
3.3 Year level, gender and country of birth responses if required (optional)

4. QUESTION 6 (Four parts presented separately)

4.1 Question 6A - report anecdotal responses by year level and/or gender demonstrating students’ views on what interventions they would recommend to friends being bullied.
4.2 Question 6B - report ‘yes’ ‘no’ and ‘maybe/depends’ responses for students by year level and/or gender in relation to whether they would tell a teacher about the bullying and report anecdotally about why students would not report to a teacher.
4.3 Question 6C - Report actual terms used by students in response to the question of who gets bullied at this school? Students will often use derogatory terms to describe victims of bullying (‘nerds’, ‘geeks’ etc) indicating an unsympathetic attitude towards them. They may also name individuals as victims of bullying and a decision must be taken about whether to inform staff of those named more than once as known victims of bullying or to deal with this privately.
4.4 Question 6D - Report actual terms used by students in response to the question of who is a bully at this school? Students will often use positive terms to describe bullies (e.g. ‘popular’) indicating an awareness of their social status. They may also name individuals as bullies and a decision must be taken about whether to inform staff of those named more than once as known bullies or to deal with this privately.
The overall impressions gained by examining responses to this question will inform and guide staff in the workshops activities further in the day. They will be introduced to the basic data results and will be able to discuss them in more detail in the workshop sessions 5.

5. QUESTION 7

Present the year level responses for this question-Does this school help student feel good about themselves? Present results for bullied and non-bullied student as it is likely that bullied students will express a different view to those who are not bullied. Gender and cultural differences may also be presented.

6. QUESTION 8

Present results for year levels and gender in relation to student willingness to assist others being bullied. It is also important to anecdotally report responses about why they will not assist as this provides indicators for intervention.

7. QUESTION 9

Present anecdotally suggestions recorded by student about how bullying can be prevented or stopped in the school. There are often useful and sensible suggestions as well as highly punitive ones and all should be discussed in preparation for workshop activities.

8. QUESTION 10

Present year level and gender responses to the question about perceived unsafe areas of the school. There may well be some surprising results and areas staff are not aware of as locations for bullying, including the classroom.

This summary actually represents an enormous amount of information for the participants in the in-service day. As all participants will be engaged in the workshop activities later in the day and will have an opportunity to examine the data in more detail it may be sufficient to provide summaries in this session. However, since this is intended to be a research based intervention it is very important that the relevant information be made as readily accessible as possible to ensure all results are considered when policy statements, procedures and products are being devised.

The data should be referred to current literature in relation to bullying and the PowerPoint presentation provided in the appendix for the conduct of the in-service session.
SECTION 3
IN-SERVICE DAY

GUIDELINES FOR WORKSHOPS TO CUSTOMISE THE INTERVENTION
GUIDELINES FOR WORKSHOPS

The workshops are designed to give all members of the school community the opportunity to contribute to the development of three major aspects of the whole-school intervention:

1. Policy development
2. Design of procedures, processes and documentation to support change
3. Design of products and adjunctive materials to guide and support students and the school community

Workshops are conducted for approximately two hours in the afternoon of the whole school in-service day and each has a particular focus. Participants in the workshop should comprise a cross-section of the school community and include teaching and administrative staff, executive staff, students, parents and other community representatives wherever possible. There should be a manageable number of participants e.g. 6-8 persons, to facilitate discussion. Leaders may be appointed by the organiser, and may be staff who have contributed to the data analysis and who can therefore discuss this aspect with some authority. On the other hand the leader may be someone with particular expertise relevant to the focus of the workshop and suggestions are made in the workshop notes about who may be suitable. The purpose of the workshop sessions is very specific and should be explained prior to any discussion. There is an expectation that each workshop will result in tangible and specified outcomes to expedite the intervention. These sessions provide the foundation materials for other important aspects of the intervention.

Fundamentally, participants will have experienced a half-day information session prior to entering the workshop, as well as having viewed the analyses of the school data. They will therefore be aware of current issues and the parameters of bullying in the school. This provides a sound basis for entering discussions about the significance and incidence of bullying in the school as well as appropriate and effective intervention.
ORGANISATION

Workshop participants:

The composition of workshop teams can be determined prior to the session, by allocating participants to particular focus groups on the basis of their perceived expertise or by allowing participants to select their own group at the start of the day. A combination of these two processes could also be offered, with workshop registration lists being posted up with the names of two or three participants who have agreed to lead or guide the work of the group. As far as possible participants should be able to attend a workshop session to which they feel they can contribute. Organisation of the teams ideally takes place before the lunch break so that groups can commence immediately. Prior to the commencement of the workshops a large envelope should be prepared and presented to the workshop leader. This will accommodate the notes and other products discussed and determined by the group. A form for recording the names of workshop group members is provided for each workshop and should be pasted onto the front of the envelope. (see appendix 4)

Contents of workshop envelope
A. Workshop notes to guide discussion
B. Copies of relevant data results for discussion
C. Three sheets for recording the group decisions: 1. Policy Statements 2. Proposals for procedures, documentation or processes to be introduced or reviewed. 3. Products to be designed and distributed
D. Blank copy of survey form for reference

Workshop locations: There are ten workshop topics and therefore there will need to be ten locations in which the teams can work. In a school this is not usually a problem as classrooms can be utilised for the workshops. Nevertheless the decision about where each group will be placed should be made and notified well in advance of the commencement of the session. It is useful to list the location with the registration sheet earlier in the day.
STRUCTURE OF EACH WORKSHOP SESSION

During the workshop session, results of the data need to be discussed and the three major areas for decision-making must be covered to ensure the intervention is facilitated. This is an opportunity for all concerned to contribute and be informed about the school approach to intervention based on school needs and indicators. Staff should be introduced to the workshop sessions by having the purpose and processes fully explained beforehand. It is suggested that the workshop session follow these general guidelines:

First half hour

Discussion of the appended data results. This may be lead by a team member who has participated in the data analysis and who may already have presented the data in an earlier session of the in-service day. All members of the workshop team will have had the opportunity to hear preliminary discussions of the results earlier in the day. The form of the data results should be clear and readily understandable without the need for a sophisticated knowledge of statistics or analysis and is usually expressed in simple percentages. The recording formats facilitate overhead projections or handouts. For example: Workshop 8: Teacher Intervention- if the data supplied to this workshop group indicates that the majority of students in years 7 and 8 would tell a friend or parent about bullying rather than a teacher (responses to question 6), the group will need to address this issue. Workshop notes will guide this discussion.

Second half hour

The group will need to determine and record on the sheet provided what statements will be incorporated into the whole school policy to address the focus topic of the workshop. For example, statements to indicate that teachers are committed and skilled in offering assistance to bullied students and the school philosophy about protection, safety etc. may be relevant for the Teacher Intervention workshop group; statements related to the use of verbally abusive language would be an appropriate policy focus for Workshop 3, Verbal Bullying. The statements should be carefully worded to reflect the data results in that they address expressed students concerns in the area.
Third half hour

The group will need to discuss *products* that the workshop can contribute or design and that can be distributed or otherwise made available to students, to record strategies and supports available. This may take the form of one or two pages in a whole school booklet addressing bullying; it could be a poster designed by staff or students; it could be a notice to be placed on the door of each teacher’s office stating their availability and commitment, or a palm card to guide students in the steps of peer intervention or reporting. Some examples of products include:

*Posters*

These are an informative and encouraging type of product to record supportive messages and even instructions to students in relation to particular issues raised in the results. These can be displayed around the school and can be produced on A3 sheets which are laminated. Students ideas are valuable for this approach but teachers and others should be given the opportunity to devise succinct statements for public display as posters.

*Bullying Information Booklet*

The school should consider producing a booklet as a tangible outcome of the in-service-day. If each workshop contributes several simple statements related to the focus of concern in their workshop, at the end of the day there will be up to twenty pages of information and guidance, support and encouragement to be distributed in a school sponsored booklet to all students and perhaps others. For example, the Verbal Bullying workshop team could produce a definition of verbal bullying, and a list of terms considered verbal bullying and therefore not acceptable. The contents of the booklet may include where to go to for help within the school, how to respond to particular types of bullying, how to register a report of bullying, self-protective behaviours such as avoidance, peer supportive behaviours to assist those being bullied etc. The booklet could be designed and illustrated by students and should include their comments and suggestions.
Other products. These include supportive and instructional notices placed strategically around the school e.g. “Student Refuge” notices displayed at one school on staffroom doors; Individual student palm cards distributed to guide student supportive interventions; anti-bullying policy summary sheets for the inner covers of student books etc.

Fourth half hour

During this section the group will need to make a determination about aspects of school organisation and administration as indicated in students responses. Students may indicate their reluctance to report incidents because of having to be seen publicly waiting outside the office of a particular staff member responsible for reports; others have expressed concern at having to wait for the school counsellor or students’ representatives for similar reasons. These issues and structures need to be addressed at this point. The team can then discuss methodologies to address the issues, perhaps by devising particular recording forms, reporting mechanisms and documentation, specific allocated staff and resources to support students, changes to rosters to facilitate supervision etc. These must be relevant to the focus topic of the workshop.

At the conclusion of the workshop session all documentation should be replaced in the workshop envelope which should also have the names of group members recorded for reference. The envelopes will be collected and organised by nominated personnel into the three working parties outlined in section 4 (Policy working party, Procedures working party, Products working party) by collating the forms included in each workshop envelope. That is, each of the ten workshop forms addressing policy statements will be examined by the Policy working party and used as a basis to formulate a whole-school policy statement. Similarly, the ten procedures pages from each workshop will be used by the Procedures team etc.

An alternative method for presentation of the workshops is to allocate a full hour for each workshop topic, (i.e. one hour to discuss the data, one hour to discuss policy statements etc) and these could be spread over a number of days. It is very useful, however to conduct the majority of the work on the day of the in-service to maintain focus and momentum.
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WORKSHOP SHOULD BE PROVIDED IN WORKSHOP ENVELOPE
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA REQUIRED: YEAR 7-12 QUESTION 6A, 6B, 7, 9, 10

Students often express the view that teachers cannot or will not be of any assistance in relation to bullying, and they cannot prevent or reduce bullying. These views are expressed in Q 6a. Nevertheless teachers must be the first avenue for protection and intervention and as such this workshop will focus on the skills and responsibilities of teachers, to ensure student confidence in teacher commitment to bullying intervention. Teacher attitudes towards bullying may therefore need to be addressed, as well as language, body language and responses to students. Who report bullying. Teachers who feel intimidated by students or others in the school community may want to address those issues in this workshop. There is no question that these are sensitive areas for discussion. However since teachers are often the first line of defence and first avenue of refuge for victims of sometimes quite severe bullying it must be established here that teachers can and will demonstrate support and appropriate responses to bullied individuals.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss survey data. The relevant information will be found in student responses to the questions listed above. The purpose is to identify student responses which indicate teacher skills and actions which are seen as supportive and helpful and those which may need review.

   TASKS:

   2. Discuss personal views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. For example, if students claim 'teachers never listen', or 'never do anything' how can students be assured that their complaints will be acted upon? Should the teacher to whom bullying has been reported issue a notice or record the incident in some way to demonstrate that the complaint has been accepted and will be addressed?

3. Discuss the level of intervention necessary, possible, to be expected and currently offered.

4. Consider: How do students determine the effectiveness of teacher intervention and protection in relation to bullying? How are teacher attitudes towards bullying conveyed to students and does this need to be altered? Teacher language which may contribute to a climate of bullying could include the use of 'pet' names, nicknames, or the use of comments which refer to gender or race unnecessarily; the use of verbal denigration or sarcasm which targets individual students or groups; negative comments referring to religion or cultural background; rejection or ignoring of student complaints about bullying or of students as individuals; humiliating or punitive practices which undermine the dignity of students. It is acknowledged that teachers are professionals and the behaviours listed here may occur infrequently or not at all. The team is required to discuss the prevalence and incidence of such behaviour and to make a determination that such behaviour will be listed in the policy and procedures as inappropriate forms of interaction. In the context of establishing a non-bullying school the difficult decisions must be taken to ensure that all members of the school community behave appropriately not just students. This level of commitment from staff indicates a genuine belief that bullying is not acceptable.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS
TEACHER PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:
The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should reflect the team's beliefs and decisions regarding acceptable teacher behaviours, personal skills, language and attitudes towards bullying. They should incorporate the expectation of respect for all and from all members of the school community; the acceptance of responsibility to act to protect students from bullying; the commitment to offer care and assistance for victims of bullying. Each of these concepts should inform the statements so that there is no doubt in reading the policy that teachers are aware of the impact of bullying and committed to its prevention.
TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team should record here the processes and procedures which can be introduced to assist teachers in this sensitive area. How can teachers be protected from bullying? How can teachers be assisted and supported to develop appropriate skills where these are lacking? Consider specific in-service training, buddy/teams, supportive programs. What form of notification can be introduced for teachers who need advice about their interactions with students? What procedures are currently available to support this element of intervention in bullying? The processes and procedures should be clearly and unequivocally supportive of a non-bullying culture and climate in the school.
TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS

Consider a student nomination form for identifying teachers who are particularly helpful and supportive in this area. E.g. 'Bullybuster of the Week'; consider a contract to be signed by all teachers and other members of the school community to commit to accepting responsibility for intervention, offering support, responding appropriately, assisting students being bullied etc. The team should also devise a page or pages for the school booklet which states their commitment in simple terms and describes the interventions and supports to be offered by teachers receiving complaints /reports of bullying.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

STUDENT PERSONAL SKILLS

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA: YEAR 7-12 QUESTION 6A, 7, 8

Students often express inappropriate attitudes and suggestions for intervention in the survey responses. These are found in responses to question 6a where students are asked to describe what they would do if a friend told them they were being bullied. They suggest retaliation, group or gang attacks on bullies, hitting or fighting the bully in ‘self-defence’, confronting and warning bullies etc. In other cases some quite appropriate and reasonable suggestions are made such as go to friends, teachers, family or the principal for help/support/reporting, talking it out, ‘sticking up for yourself’ etc. The responses reveal some confusion between bullying and fighting or conflict situations which will be addressed in the curriculum component of intervention but which should also be identified here. Fundamentally, bullying is not conflict but abuse and students need to understand that victims will not ‘benefit’ from the bullying, nor are they equally culpable with the bully. The overall picture is usually that students have a limited repertoire of sound and effective responses to bullying situations. The focus of this team is to consider ways to empower students who witness, know of or are victims of bullying. This will involve the development of personal skills and strategies as well as information about school processes and procedures for protection and intervention, such as formal reporting mechanisms.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss the survey data. The relevant information will be found in students responses to the questions listed above. The purpose is to identify students responses which indicate inappropriate and appropriate skills and attitudes and to bring these to the conscious attention of students through the policy, procedures and products devised by this workshop team.

2. Tasks: Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data.

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available to help students develop appropriate attitudes to bullying.

4. Consider: What personal skills may need to be developed in students experiencing witnessing or engaging in bullying? (e.g. Resilience, assertiveness, non-acceptance of the behaviour, resistance, accepting responsibility for intervention and reporting.) How can appropriate and effective ‘fighting back’ be taught? (e.g. refusal to comply with bully demands, reporting, assertive language skills etc.) Addressing the ‘dabbing’ issue. “Dabbing is the reporting of insignificant and harmless behaviour. Students need to be able to differentiate legitimate reporting of harmful and abusive behaviour from ‘dabbing’. Peer responsibility for assisting those being bullied or seeking assistance for them. Remedial intervention for bullies-therapeutic and individual training and counselling to ensure appropriate skills are developed; restitution and apologising; restricting access to victims; supervision and close monitoring of those observed or reported bullying.
TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:
The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. These statements need to reflect the team's decisions about what is reasonable behaviour to expect. It is this team which will produce the definitive statements of what the school will view as bullying behaviour and these need to be listed and identified specifically in this section. The rejection of such behaviours in any member of the school community should also be included here. Statements which refer to students taking responsibility for assisting their bullied peers, reporting bullying, offering protective intervention and help-seeking are also appropriate statements. There perhaps should also be statements which identify the types of supportive individual interventions to be offered to victims of bullying to facilitate behavioural change and statements about the responsibility of the bully to change their behaviour. The statements reflect the whole school view about bullying behaviour.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

STUDENT PERSONAL SKILLS

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team should record here the processes and procedures which can be introduced to assist students in the development of appropriate personal skills. This could include help-seeking and reporting strategies and processes; specific programs, curricula and other training to facilitate anti-bullying behaviour. There should be a decision taken about the issue of 'dobbing' and a distinction made between 'dobbing' and legitimate reporting of harmful and abusive behaviour. A reporting procedure may be determined by this team. A commitment to the Peer Advocacy training program (Healey, 2004) or similar should be made here, as well as the availability of remedial programs to assist bullies and their victims.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

MODULE 2

STUDENT PERSONAL SKILLS

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS

The team should discuss products to support the application of the policy in relation to student personal skills and behaviour. These may take the form of a some pages in the school information booklet which identify and guide students in appropriate behaviours to use in the event of bullying—either as a victim or an observer. These pages may also contain specific listed behaviours to be viewed as unacceptable and defined as bullying behaviours in students. Devise a reporting form or procedure for reporting bullying; devise a poster to inform students of the availability of supports and procedures.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

VERBAL BULLYING

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA: YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS 4.1,4.2,4.4,4.6,4.7; Q5;

Student are able to record their experiences of verbal bullying in several of the parts of question four of the survey which ask about name-calling, teasing, comments about family, religion and cultural background as well as appearance. If the behaviour has been reported as bullying in the survey responses then it must be addressed in the intervention. More resilient students may view some forms of name-calling as acceptable or expected and therefore not record it as bullying or not feel particularly concerned about it.

FOCUS: Others may not see such behaviour as bullying. Nevertheless, the team must determine the impact of the behaviours and the extent to which they contribute to a pattern of bullying in the school. The must discuss what interventions including sanctions may be required. Students are also asked how big a problem bullying is in the school (Q5). In most such surveys non-bullied students are in the majority and most do not therefore see bullying as a major problem. However, since the concern is for bullied individuals and these usually do see bullying as a major problem, this must be taken into consideration during discussions.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:
1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify particular verbal behaviours of concern and to determine the appropriate intervention strategies to address this sensitive issue.

TASKS: 2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data.

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available when students experience verbal bullying or harassment.

4. Consider: a methodology for determining the level of impact of the verbal bullying; student self-report could be considered (e.g. a continuum report format to indicate severity teasing......................threats;) opportunity to report actual words and language used. The team should also consider verbal bullying of and by all members of the school community including parents and teachers. An intervention which only considers and addresses student to student verbal bullying will not effective, particularly if staff are seen to use verbal bullying or if the verbal bullying of staff is ignored or treated differently. Parent to teacher verbal bullying should also be discussed; the legal implications of verbally abusive language, defamatory remarks, vilification etc should be considered and notified in the whole school information booklet; specific terms which the team believes should never be permitted to be used within the school should be identified, listed and notified to the school community together with proposed sanctions; for example negative racial terms ('bung' 'slant eyes') and sexual references ('slut' 'poofter') should certainly incur consequences as should threats. Consequences could include public, written, private or mediated apologies; requirement to attend social or other skills development programs to acquire the appropriate behaviours.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

VERBAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should reflect the genuine concern of the team for the use of appropriate and inoffensive language throughout the school. The statements should refer to all members of the school community and should refer to being respectful and careful in verbal interactions. The specific terms which are deemed unacceptable should be recorded in the policy statements to ensure there is no ambiguity about what is acceptable and appropriate. The team will need to be particularly skillful in wording the statements to avoid confusion and set a high standard for verbal interactions.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

MODULE 3:

VERBAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team will need to discuss and record here the procedures for intervention when verbal bullying or harassment are encountered or observed. How will students and other members of the school community be notified of breaches? What specific information with regard to legal implications of sexually and racially explicit terms will be provided and how will this be done? What education programs could be introduced for those who persist in using inappropriate language and who is available to put them in place (e.g. school counsellor)?
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

MODULE 3:

VERBAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS

The team should compose the content of pages to be included in the whole school information booklet with regard to verbal bullying specifically. There could be a poster designed to inform the school community of the legal and school sanctions for verbal bullying. The format for recording the impact of the verbal abuse could also be devised in this discussion.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

PHYSICAL BULLYING

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 4.9, 5, 6C, 6D,

Results of the survey often yield information about a wide range of inappropriate physical interactions and abusive behaviour between students and sometimes other school community members. Students report being hit, kicked and punched as well as having to hand over their belongings and having their property damaged on purpose. The focus of this team is to determine appropriate and acceptable physical interactions between members of the school community. Some schools have made the mistake of stating that the school has a ‘no touching’ policy through out the school between all members of the school community. However, since it is virtually impossible to teach and to learn without any physical touching occurring, the rule simply causes confusion. The important distinction to make in this regard, given child protection legislation and requirements is that there are appropriate and inappropriate forms of physical interaction and that these will be identified and notified in this schools’ intervention program.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify the specific behaviours of concern and to notify these to the school community. It is also a task of this team to decide the reporting mechanisms and sanctions to be applied in the case of physical bullying.

TASKS:

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. Some team members may be aware to a greater degree of the levels of inappropriate physical interaction because of their subject area or activities with students.

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available when students experience physical bullying. It is important for this team to be cognisant of the difference between fighting and bullying and to express such differentiation in the sanctions and interventions applied. Bullying is not fighting and it is not play. Bullying in this case is physical abuse which can have serious psychological and physical consequences for the victim. Fighting involves reciprocal conflict in which both parties are equally culpable. The team must use the guidelines provided for determine whether the incident is one of fighting or physical peer abuse. The level of damage sustained by the victim is often a good indicator as well as the frequency of the incidents involving particular individuals.

4. Consider: Do different physically abusive behaviours warrant different consequences or approaches to intervention? How can the severity and impact of a particular behaviour be measured against others? How do students report the behaviour and its impact? Are students encouraged to report the behaviour and how do teachers respond? What reporting procedure should be devised? Discuss the legal implications of the reported behaviours. How will restitution of damaged property be monitored? Discuss teacher responsibilities for supervision. Discuss teacher responsibilities under the child protection legislation and whether mandatory reporting needs to be applied in such cases.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

PHYSICAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should identify specific behaviours which are deemed physical bullying or abuse, including those listed but could incorporate others. The statements should reflect the team's concern for the physical welfare, safety and protection of all school community members from the abusive physical behaviours of others in the school community. They should express the inappropriateness of the behaviours and the fact that they are not acceptable in the school. The statements should encourage all victims of such abuse to have the courage to report the behaviour. The statements should clarify the differences between 'fighting' when all involved students are equally responsible and hurt each other; 'play' in which all participants are happy and enjoying the activity and 'bullying' in which the victim is an unwilling participant.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

MODULE 4:

PHYSICAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team must determine the procedures to be implemented when physical bullying is witnessed, and the criteria to be used to determine the veracity of the claims of bullies that they are 'playing' or 'fighting'. Fundamentally if anyone is being hurt the activity cannot be designated as play. If one individual is being hurt when involved with a group or another individual the chances are that they are being bullied, particularly if the behaviour happens on more than one occasion. The team may wish to determine the 'referee's decision' rule applies and teachers will have the final say about what the behaviour constitutes. Teacher intervention at the site of the event could involve the application of sanctions such as time-out, apologies, recording of the incident as bullying, physical isolation from the victim. A continuum of consequences may be determined including legal sanctions if deemed serious enough.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

PHYSICAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS

The team should decide what will be included in the pages of the school information booklet in relation to physical bullying. This product will be distributed to all the students and other members of the school community and should delineate abusive physical behaviours and their inappropriateness in the school. The team may wish to devise a poster to inform all school community members what constitutes physical abuse and how to report it. They may design a palm card for students to carry to inform them how to seek help and protect themselves from physical bullying.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

CULTURAL or RACIAL BULLYING

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA REQUIRED: YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS 3, Q 4.1,4.2,4.7, Q 9 Current school
harassment policy

Survey results will indicate students who experience personal and cultural bullying from the
responses to parts of question 4. These refer to comments about family, country of
birth, religion, and appearance. Question 3 provides the information about the cultural
background of the student and although students cannot be identified as individuals it is
possible to match responses to cultural groups to determine whether racially-based bully-
ing is occurring. It may be useful to discuss the current school harassment policy if there is
one and incorporate elements into the new school policy on bullying. The focus for this
team is to determine the extent of culturally-based abuse and the impact.

FOCUS: levels and severity of such abuse in the school community. This is a sensitive
issue but must be discussed fully and frankly within the workshop confines. It
may be that there are isue of culture which impact on teachers and parents and which re-
result in bullying across a range of cultural groups including Australians. An anti-bullying in-
tervention cannot provide more protection for one cultural group than it does for another so
all must be considered equally.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:
1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify
the specific behaviours of concern and to notify these to the school
community. It is also the task of this team to determine the reporting mechanisms and
sanctions to be applied in the case of racial or cultural bullying.

TASKS:

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data.
Some team members may be aware to a greater degree of the levels of cultural bullying
because of the subject area they teach or other activities.

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and cur-
rently available when students experience racial or cultural bullying.

4. Consider: How strategies already in place to deal with this problem are effectively used. Do they need to be reviewed or adapted to deal with the issue of bullying? Legal implica-
tions of persistent racially-based bullying within the school community between students and possibly also teachers and parents; notification procedures including documentation and recording of complaints, a grievance committee operable for and by all members of the school community; strategies for responding to reports of racially-based bullying including restitution, apologies (personal and private or general and public), sanctions and consequences. It may also be useful for the team to consider some of the suggestions made by students in response to Question 9 which asks how bullying can be stopped. There are often ideas here for cultural days and experiences to reinforce the positive foundation values of the Australian culture as multi-cultural and diverse. Most students do not experience bullying or racial bullying and most students are reasonably aware of the need for tolerance. Nevertheless, the needs of those who do must be addressed in this inter-
tvention.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

CULTURAL OR RACIAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to racial or cultural bullying and should specify the language and terms deemed unacceptable and inappropriate. They should reflect the team's views on the issues of rights, respect for cultural difference, expectations for specific levels and quality of behaviour in relation to the cultural background of all members of the school community.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

CULTURAL OR RACIAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:
The team must determine the procedures to be implemented when racial or cultural bullying is witnessed or reported. The team should record their suggestions for intervention and education in relation to racially-based bullying. They should list or state what processes, sanctions and activities will be implemented to address the problem. How will current practices be altered, adapted or superimposed into the bullying policy to deal with the problem? What are the expected procedures for school community members to employ in notification and management?
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

CULTURAL OR RACIAL BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS
The team should decide what will be included in the pages of the school information booklet in relation to racial or cultural bullying. They may devise a poster to inform the school community about this aspect of bullying and/or the school policy in relation to racial bullying. The team may also devise a recording format for reporting of instances of racial bullying and determine the process for maintaining such reports.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

ABILITY-BASED BULLYING

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA REQUIRED: YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS Q 4, Q 5, Q7, Q8,

The survey form does not contain items which specifically identify disabilities as a focus for bullying. However, it is apparent that students included in the mainstream of education who have significant or noticeable disabilities of intellectual or physical functioning may experience bullying. The focus for this team is to specifically identify behaviours which will impact on the welfare and self-esteem of students with disability or different abilities including gifted students. The team will need to orient their discussions towards an educative intervention for all students to ensure those with different abilities are included and accepted. Question 4 identifies bullying behaviours which may be experienced by those students who are integrated and who have identified disabilities. There may well be other members of the school community who also have disabilities and who may experience bullying including teachers and parents. At times, individuals with particular gifts and talents are also bullied. It is important to address the attitudes of all members of the school community as well as their willingness to assist those being bullied.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify the specific behaviours of concern and to notify these to the school community. It is also the task of this team to determine the reporting mechanisms and sanctions to be applied in the case of disability-based bullying.

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. Some team members may be aware to a greater degree of the levels of such bullying because of the subject area they teach or other activities. In particular the views of special education teachers, support teacher (learning) and/or teacher aide special would be valuable to this discussion.

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available when students experience bullying on the basis of their disability or perceive ability.

4. Consider: How has the school community been kept informed of the needs and capacities of those with identified disability? Often bullying is based in ignorance of these factors. Has an educative process for inclusion of those with disabilities been implemented? Are teachers exemplary in their attitudes towards and interactions with those with disability to provide modelling for other members of the school community? The legal implications of exclusionary practices need to be considered, as well as the rationale for any differentiation of opportunities for such individuals. Tolerance of difference in appearance and ability is a key factor in the bullying of individuals with disability and the team should consider an on-going program of education and support for establishing appropriate attitudes. While it is unlikely that students gifted in sport will be bullied, those displaying academic gifts and talents may. Notification procedures for those with disability may need to be adapted so that their reporting of incidents can be facilitated. There may be a need for verbal reporting recorded by a designated member of staff. The willingness of students to assist those being bullied is recorded in Question 8 and may need to be discussed specifically in relation to those with disability. If students express a willingness to help they may be recruited to be a ‘buddy’ for a period of time to a n individual with disability. Other supportive structures may be considered by this team.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

ABILITY -BASED BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to bullying on the basis of perceived incapacity and disability, and should specify the language and terms deemed unacceptable and inappropriate. They should reflect the team's views on the issues of rights, respect for difference, expectations for specific levels and quality of behaviour in relation to the physical and intellectual capacities of all members of the school community. It should clear from these statements that the bullying of those with actual or perceived disability is unacceptable.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

ABILITY –BASED BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team should discuss procedures for implementation of inclusive practices in the school including whole school education programs to inform and support the school community in their interactions with those with disability. This could include excursions outside the school to meet and assist and observe those with disabilities achieving in the community. Consider Olympic athletes, wheelchair basketball and other sports persons as well as those working in a variety of industries, as well as special schools and organisations. These experiences will contribute to knowledge and attitudes development. Inclusive practices will need to be carefully structured within the school and those arrangements are outside the scope of this intervention. However the success and thoroughness of those arrangements may well impact the bullying of these individuals.
3.1 INTERPERSONAL FACTORS

ABILITY -BASED BULLYING

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS
The team should decide what will be included in the pages of the school information booklet in relation to disability -based bullying. They may devise a poster to inform the school community about this aspect of bullying and/or the school policy in relation to such bullying. The team may also devise a recording format for reporting of instances of bullying of those with disability and determine the process for maintaining such reports. It may be useful to devise a certificate for awarding to those who have been to an outside organisation for experience with individuals with disability either on a voluntary or school -organised basis.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP

DATA: YEARS 7-12  QUESTION 10 ,4.9,
The survey is likely to identify a number of locations, areas and environmental factors seen as contributing to bullying This team's focus is to consider what changes could or should be made to particular areas, usage and even design to discourage bullying. There are 11 nominated areas on the survey form and students can add others if they have specific concerns. There are usually some surprising responses including the classroom as a likely location for bullying. While teachers may believe their classroom supervision will prevent bullying, it may be manifest in events which occur just prior to entering the classroom, such as the destruction of homework, stealing or hiding or damaging property needed for classroom work. This may relate to the location of bags and other belongings outside the classroom. Assembly of student prior to entering the classroom or the supervision of student before entering the classroom. Although secondary student may be expected to function without teacher supervision in these situations, if bullying is occurring it may be that changes need to be made to these arrangements.

FOCUS: The workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify the specific behaviours of concern and to notify these to the school community. It is also the task of this team to determine the reporting mechanisms and sanctions to be applied in the case of bullying occurring in particular locations of the school environment. The locations named by students as unsafe must be addressed by the team to ensure intervention is effective.

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. Some team members may be aware to a greater degree of the levels of such bullying because of the school areas and locations in which they teach (eg gym, outdoor sports areas, library, bus waiting areas, canteen and recreational activity areas).

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available when students experience bullying in particular areas of the school.

4. Consider: toilets and change-rooms are often considered vulnerable locations for bullying to occur as teachers are understandably reluctant to be seen in these locations. Nevertheless, since the bullying unlikely to continue without teacher supervision it may be a decision of this team that supervision at these locations must be increased. Pairs of teachers may be assigned to supervise these sensitive locations. While the privacy of student needs to be a prime consideration, so must their safety. Factors to consider include the number of student using the facility at one time and whether these can be staggered; student is to monitor but not oversee activities in these locations; notify parents of student and teacher concerns and seek suggestions from all members of the school community regarding intervention; bus and other travel to school is also often mentioned as unsafe and the team will need to define the parameters of school responsibility and advise student where to seek help if bullied in these locations; there is a measure of community responsibility which can be expected and needs to be discussed for inclusion in the intervention.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:
The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to bullying in particular areas of the school which are identified from the survey data and listed here. They should specify the behaviours which have been reported and which are deemed unacceptable and inappropriate. They should reflect the team's views on the expectations of specific levels and quality of behaviour in relation to unsupervised activities and areas during school time. Of course the statements must refer to all members of the school community and should include reference to the interactions between teachers and student and parents and how these will be managed to avoid vulnerable situations.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:
The team should record their decisions about the procedures for reporting bullying in particular areas of the school and how these areas will be monitored in the future. The team should suggest a definition of the parameters of responsibility the school should notify to the community (e.g., the school will accept responsibility for the safe travel of students to the school or the school cannot accept this responsibility). Proposed changes to usage or design of particular areas of the school and suggestions for supervision changes or implementation.
TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS

The team should determine the content of the pages to be included in the school information booklet and should refer specifically to particular areas of concern. These pages will inform the school community of the decisions taken to provide a safe environment, but need to specify the locations and interventions proposed rather than stating the school should simply be a 'safe place'. The team may also consider the design of posters to be placed in strategic locations about the school to remind school community members about their personal responsibility for the safety and welfare of themselves and others.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

OUT-OF-CLASS SUPERVISION

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 4.9, 6B, 8, 9, 10

The survey results are likely to pinpoint situations and locations which seem to offer
the greatest opportunities for bullying to occur. Out-of-class activities and routines in particu-
lar provide bullies with access to victims in often unsupervised circumstances.
The focus of this team is to identify from the data and other information available to them the
situations in which out-of-class supervision is needed and should be estab-
lished. It will be apparent for the survey responses that there is a need for in-
creased out-of-class supervision and this may not be a very popular decision with school
staff. Nevertheless, if this has been identified in the student reports of bullying it must be ad-
dressed in the intervention, and the team will need to consider ways in which increased su-
pervision at vulnerable times and in particular locations, can be provided. Movement around
the school between periods and at break times is often unsupervised in the belief that stu-
dent are capable of finding their own way and responsible enough to arrive on time. How-
ever, these expectations for responsible and appropriate behaviour must also be applied in
the case of bullying. If students are not behaving in appropriate ways during these times and
engaging in bullying they may need to have a ‘nanny’ or ‘buddy’ to escort them to their
classes. This approach is unpopular and often reduces the incidence.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake:

1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify
the specific behaviours, times and locations of concern and to notify these to the school com-
nunity. It is also the task of this team to determine the reporting mechanisms and sanctions
TASKS: to be applied in the case of bullying occurring in particular locations and times in
the school timetable of activities and classes. The need to increase supervision
should be discussed.

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. Some team mem-
ers may be aware to a greater degree of the levels of such bullying because of the school
areas and locations in which they teach (e.g. gym, outdoor sports areas; library, bus waiting
areas; canteen and recreational activity areas).

3. Determine the level of intervention that is possible, to be expected, necessary and cur-
rently available when students experience bullying at specific times and in particular areas of
the school when teacher supervision is minimal or not available.

4. Consider: How can play and leisure periods out-of-class be better monitored without ex-
cessive increases in teacher duties; student monitors may be recruited to accept responsibil-
ity for monitoring particular areas and locations out-of-class; supervision during movement
about the school in corridors in particular may need adaptations; changes to the frequency
and density of student movement may need to be considered; isolated locations such as
basketball courts, ovals and change-rooms also provide opportunities for bullying to occur;
How are ‘free’ periods supervised and located to avoid opportunities for bullying? How are
the travel and supervision arrangements for sporting activities monitored and supervised? In-
school, inter-school, training, coaching, and captaincy of sports teams all provide opportuni-
ties for bullying out-of-class. The decisions taken to provide protective intervention must
also take into account the possibility that teachers, coaches and parents involved in sports
teams may bully or be bullies and how they will be given access to supportive or remedial
intervention.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

OUT-OF-CLASS SUPERVISION

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to bullying in particular areas of the school which are identified from the survey data and listed here. They should specify the behaviours which have been reported and which are deemed unacceptable and inappropriate. They should reflect the team’s views on the expectations of specific levels and quality of behaviour in relation to unsupervised activities and areas during school time. Of course the statements must refer to all members of the school community and should include reference to the interactions between teachers and student and parents and how these will be managed to avoid vulnerable situations. Particular emphasis may need to be placed on sporting and recreational /leisure activities during school time.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

OUT-OF-CLASS SUPERVISION

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team will need to record here their decisions about increases or other changes to the supervision regime within the school for out-of-class activities. Equitable distribution of staff involvement in supervision must be addressed. The team will also need to determine how reporting of such incidents during out-of-class activities will be undertaken and how students and others will be assured of protection during these periods. The role of supplementary supervisors such as parents and students may also need to be discussed and considered.
3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

OUT-OF-CLASS SUPERVISION

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS:

The team should determine the content of the pages to be included in the school information booklet and should refer specifically to particular areas and times of concern, such as travel for sport and excursions and movement between classes. These pages will inform the school community of the decisions taken to provide additional supervision, and need to specify the locations and interventions proposed. New regulations about out-of-class behaviour, routines and responsibilities may also be included here. A poster or other form of notice to record timetable changes or duty rosters should be discussed or devised. Changes may not involve increases but a re-deployment or rationalisation of current staff practices and time. List changes to routines which could reduce the number, range or composition of students and activities relevant to the issue.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

DOCUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 6A, 6B, 7, 9, 10

The documentation of reported incidents of bullying should enable the school to track locations, personnel, students, types of behaviour and procedures relevant to intervention and prevention of bullying. Documentation should provide the data upon which decisions are based about organisational, personal and curricular practices currently in place or needed to assist in the management of bullying. The focus of this team is to identify or devise for the school community such procedures and practices to support intervention.

FOCUS: Additionally, the team needs to discuss the level and parameters of responsibility of all school community members with regard to intervention. Teachers are seen as the first line of support for those being bullied and this is often recorded in the survey response. However, it is the responsibility of all community members including peers of bullied students to accept some measure of responsibility for intervention and protection. Observers of bullying cannot be neutral in their responses and must act in a supportive manner. The team will need to express these and other relevant issues in their contribution.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake
1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify the specific documentation required, procedures to be introduced and responsibilities to be accepted and to notify these to the school community. It is also the task of this team to determine the specific manner in which reporting mechanisms and sanctions to be applied in the case of bullying will be recorded and maintained. The data will provide indicators about the needs for these interventions.

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data. There may already be documentation and procedures used in the school to record instances of inappropriate behaviour and these may be adapted here. There may be some concern about the maintenance of such records but the Privacy and Personal Information Act (1998) makes provision for such records to be kept as long as they are available to the individuals of concern. There is no question that effective intervention relies on accurate data.

3. Determine the level of documentation, that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently available when students experience bullying.

4. Consider. Legislative provisions that require that teachers and others who are aware of abusive behaviour towards children and young people must report to the relevant community department—the use of these mandatory reporting provisions to provide protection for individuals being bullied should be considered. This way the responsibility for intervention and protection is shared between the school and other authorities; the design of a functional reporting form which provides all necessary information efficiently. Where and when forms will be completed, by whom and how they will be submitted An email address may provide a measure of security for those reporting bullying; who should have access to the data? Who is responsible for acting on the report? Where should the information be stored and for what purposes? How can the information provided assist in the design and implementation of intervention? Non-negotiable procedures for recording reports provided to staff; (e.g. acceptance, belief, verbal reassurances, written notification to senior staff or anti-bullying committee); application to all members of the school community.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

MODULE 9:

DOCUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to the forms of documentation to be introduced or used in the event of reporting bullying; the statements should probably indicate that reports from any member of the school community will be addressed in a confidential, supportive and protective manner. The team should state the purpose, applications and availability of data collected and clarify the commitment of the school to establishing accountability practices for intervention in bullying. The role and utilisation of legislative provisions should be addressed.
TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

This team has an important responsibility to record the process teachers and others receiving reports about bullying should adopt. Elements of the procedure could include: the format of the report (verbal, written, emailed etc); details — name of complainant, nature of the complaint, follow-up interview? Who to conduct? Where, when, how often? Procedures to ensure the victim is protected from further abuse; who to investigate? How to ensure the view that teachers cannot or will not help is not reinforced by the outcome of the report? Specify the location, purpose availability and types of information to be recorded.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

DOCUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS:

The team should determine the content of the pages to be included in the school information booklet and should refer specifically to particular forms and procedures to be introduced to intervene in bullying. These pages will inform the school community of the decisions taken to record and address specific reports of bullying as well as the protective interventions to be applied, e.g. restricting access of the bully to the victim until investigations completed. They could also express the school view about the role of child protection legislation and how or whether this will be implemented to address bullying. The team may design or at least list the key elements of a reporting form or procedure; a palm card may be designed for all student and school community members listing the steps to be taken in the event of bullying and the options for support. The team may design a poster listing the steps and options for intervention and protection within the school for all school community members.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERVENTION

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP
DATA YEARS 7-12; QUESTIONS 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 7, 8, 9, 10

Survey responses often indicate that while bullied student view bullying as serious problem in the school, those not experiencing the behaviours view the problem as mild or insignificant. This has obvious implications for the support and protection of those being bullied. The focus of this team is to identify the role and responsibilities that student can undertake in the intervention. It is evident that the support and protection of peers is necessary for victims of bullying to overcome the impact. A specific training program has been developed to introduce these skills to young people (see Peer Advocacy, Healey, 2004) and the school may wish to consider introducing the program for supportive intervention. Student also indicate their awareness of who is being bullied and who is a bully in the survey responses and these can assist the team in determining which student are suitable for inclusion in a more responsible position of management of bullying. The team needs to address the issues of student attitudes towards bullying and ways in which their responsibility for and responsiveness to such incidents can be acknowledged. By involving student in the decision-making and application processes their level of personal commitment will be increased.

This workshop has the following tasks to undertake
1. Discuss the relevant survey data provided. The purpose is to identify the specific procedures and training to be introduced and responsibilities to be accepted by students and to notify these to the school community. It is also the task of this team to determine the specific needs for student involvement as indicated in the survey responses. If student state that they are ambivalent about helping those they see being bullied this is a clear indicator for training and education.

2. Discuss team views, knowledge and information relevant to the data.

3. Determine the level of involvement and responsibility that is possible, to be expected, necessary and currently evident in student when others are experience bullying.

4. Consider. Student representation in the development of policy, procedures, and reporting and intervention processes; inclusion of student on the consolidation teams to finalise the policy, procedures and products devised as an outcome of the in-service day; How can student be legitimately involved in supervision and monitoring of their peers to ensure bullying does not occur or is reported? Students need to be educated about the difference between ‘dobs’ and ‘reporting’ as to insist that student who are being bullied should not report is to condemn them to a passive response to their abuse; all students in a particular cohort e.g all year 10. should be involved rather than a selected few; student curriculum about bullying (see Peer Advocacy program); the level and capacity of student responsibility for identifying, resisting and reporting incidents of bullying.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERVENTION

TEAM DECISIONS:

POLICY STATEMENTS:

The statements recorded here are for inclusion in the whole school policy on bullying. The statements should specifically refer to the important role peers of bullied student can play in protection and intervention. The team should express their beliefs about the capacity of students to be involved in protection and support of bullied peers. The statements should probably make reference to student commitment, responsibility and efforts as well as their significance in the intervention and prevention process.
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERVENTION

TEAM DECISIONS:

PROCEDURES:

The team should record here the ways in which they believe student could be involved in addressing the issues of bullying in the school. These could include: input at staff meetings, membership on an anti-bullying committee; rostered and guided supervision or monitoring of sensitive areas where bullying may occur such as toilets and change-rooms; devising posters to offer supportive messages to bullied peers; contributions to the school information booklet regarding protective behaviours and processes in which peers are involved;
3.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERVENTION

TEAM DECISIONS:

PRODUCTS:

The team should determine the content of the pages to be included in the school information booklet or should engage students to devise such information pages. They should refer specifically to particular roles and procedures to be introduced to permit peers of bullied students to intervene in bullying. The team should record here their ideas about the tangible articles students can produce to express their support for victims and rejection of bullying. These could include: posters, a t-shirt logo, badge, pamphlet listing a student support team etc.
SECTION 4

CONSOLIDATION OF POLICY
PROCEDURES AND PRODUCTS

4.1 STRUCTURING A WHOLE SCHOOL ANTI-BULLYING POLICY

4.2 PROCEDURES AND DOCUMENTATION

4.3 PRODUCTS FOR DISPLAY AND DISTRIBUTION
CONSOLIDATION OF POLICY, PROCEDURES AND PRODUCTS

Following the completion of the workshops during the in-service day, it will be necessary to convene three working parties to consolidate the contributions of each workshop team into the three key areas discussed in the workshops. This is a task that needs to be undertaken within a few days of the in-service so that momentum is not lost and teams remain familiar with the purpose and outcomes of the process. The role of each team is to combine the policy statements, procedural decisions and products devised in the workshops into comprehensive documents which customise intervention. This process is likely to take several weeks to finalise as there will be a good deal of information to read, assess, rationalise and present coherently to the school community.

STEP 1: Remove from the workshop envelopes the specific sheets related to policy statements, procedures and products. These should have been completed and submitted by each workshop team so there will be ten of each.

STEP 2: The policy statements should be placed together in an envelope for the POLICY working party.

The procedures sheets should be placed together in the envelope for the PROCEDURES working party;

The products sheets should be placed together in an envelope for the PRODUCTS working party.

If in need of further guidelines for the composition of statements related to the focus topic, refer to the notes in this manual for each workshop.

Policy Working Party:

This team will read and review the policy statements provided by each workshop team. The workshop teams each had a particular focus and were directed to record statements for inclusion in the policy document, which specifically referred to the focus of the workshop. The directions given to the workshop team are at the head of the policy sheet for each workshop. This working party needs to assess the content of the statements, determine their relevance and specificity for the focus topic and reword if necessary to ensure that the policy document does cover each of the identified topics. Fundamentally, the policy document produced for the whole school intervention should honestly and accurately reflect the decisions taken by the workshop teams in terms of emphasis and broad application. The following section provides guidelines for the structure of the policy.
Procedures Working Party
This team will read and review the procedural decisions taken by each workshop team. The workshop teams were all required to determine the procedures for reporting, support and intervention related to their focus areas as identified at the head of the workshop procedures sheet. There may well be some overlap in the forms and procedures suggested but the pooled and revised suggestions should facilitate the development of specific processes for reporting, recording and structured intervention. The role of this working party is to formalise the procedures suggested in the workshops.

Products Working Party
This team will read and review the decisions taken by each workshop team with regard to products for display and distribution in the bullying intervention. The workshop teams were all required to determine the contents of the pages they would incorporate into the school information booklet about bullying. It will be the responsibility of this team to collate the information pages and present them in a novel and attractive booklet format which informs and guides intervention. Other products such as pamphlets, posters and tangible items should also be finalised by this working party as well as decisions about who will be involved in their production.
4.1 STRUCTURING THE WHOLE SCHOOL ANTI-BULLYING POLICY

Designing a policy for a non-bullying school reflects a proactive approach on the part of school community members, in that they are making a conscious decision to manage their environment in a positive way. It reflects a corporate commitment to establishing and maintaining morale and illustrates a philosophical commitment to equity by addressing the unequal power relationships between participants. If it specifies procedures, responsibilities and resources, it will facilitate the maintenance of the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of all parties. The policy should be designed to define relationships, acknowledge individual differences in ability, personal style and goals, and should state the training and support mechanisms which will be available to ensure that all concerned have their legitimate needs met. While such a policy statement should clarify responsive procedures for intervention, the major thrust should be to record a practical and philosophical statement in relation to maintaining a safe and nurturing environment through the development of attitudes, skills and knowledge which reject bullying.

In structuring the policy, the following key components should be considered:

A. Philosophical Statements
B. Personnel, Student & Community Considerations
C. Programs, strategies and skills
D. Resources

A. PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENTS

Schools are now adept at recording statements related to their mission or purpose, but after the initial glow of success when the statement is produced in a glossy format, such statements may well be shelved and forgotten. The key to an effective philosophical statement is that it be brief, coherent, comprehensive and accessible. The statement should belong to the school community and reflect a genuine belief in what they expect they can achieve in the management of violence. It should therefore be composed following input from staff, students and the community. It should be consistently visible and frequently reinforced. Even primary aged children can understand fairness, safety and rights if the concepts are delivered in understandable phraseology.
The philosophical statement is not the time to state rules and warn of dire consequences. It records how the school thinks and feels about bullying prevention and illustrates a commitment to maintaining a safe and secure environment for all. Stated positively it should refer to such elements as:

i) school being a safe place for students and for staff. This of course includes offenders and prospective offenders. Abusive and emotionally or physically damaging behaviour should be equally rejected in adult personnel and students.

ii) school being a non-bullying place. It needs to be said, and it needs to be confirmed, that bullying behaviour by any member of the school community will not be tolerated. Students will know when the philosophical statement refers to them but not to parents, teachers, ground staff or other adults at the school who may exhibit bullying or aggressive behaviours. A categorical statement about which behaviours will be expected and which will not be accepted should be included. Such behaviours as verbal abuse (name-calling, swearing, shouting and sarcasm) and physical abuse (pushing, striking, throwing objects etc) should be clearly identified and listed as inappropriate.

iii) the school recognizing, identifying and listing legal, moral and psychological rights of the members of the school community; an accompanying schedule of such rights could be produced for display

iv) identification of the school community view on responsibilities of members to sustain a non-bullying environment; this schedule could also be produced as a poster for display or inclusion in student books, teacher programmes etc The philosophical statement should also indicate that training and support will be available for those members of the school community whose behaviour indicates that their personal philosophy of bullying differs substantially from the communal view and the statement should be in terms which identify measurable or specific behaviours to be demonstrated in the quest for a non bullying school.

The policy development working party will utilise the statements formulated in the workshop sessions by staff and community members to structure their document. The key to the success of such a policy document is that it is recognisable by as many personnel as possible as containing statement which reflect their views as expressed in the workshops. Direct quotations of statements provided therefore are recommended for inclusion. This team needs to examine the workshop note pages in detail and to incorporate as much of the content as possible in the composition of the policy statement.
B. PERSONNEL, STUDENT & COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS

Students need to be prepared and supported in developing individual strategies for preventing their victimization at school. The two major groups identified as likely to be involved in incidents seem to be a physically weak and emotionally insecure group of children who are generally on the receiving end of the bullying perpetrated, and a socially/emotionally immature group of children who perpetrate the bullying against other children. However these characteristics may not be evident in others in the bullying paradigm when the bully has high social status and the victim's help-seeking is ignored or rejected. This does not take account either, of the partnerships between potentially aggressive adults in the school environment and vulnerable children, nor does it distinguish the teacher who is a victim of individual or group student bullying perpetrated against her. Clearly each member of this equation needs an individualized programme to prevent the ongoing negative relationship.

i) Students

Clarification of the means through which students may be included in policy development and implementation procedures should be identified. Formulation of a student representative council membership on the school anti-bullying committee or representative body should also be specified. From the statements provided in workshop responses the team should identify those which seem to focus on students behaviour only when the behaviour of the whole school community needs to be addressed. The workshops which specifically focus on involvement of students should be examined here and the statements recorded as part of the policy. Providing for the identification of student academic, social and physical needs on an individual and group basis is also fundamental to the structure of an effective policy. This needs to be thoroughly explored as the evidence is overwhelming that students with learning, social, emotional and often physical impairments are the ones most likely to be victims or perpetrators of bullying or aggression in schools. These students are more likely to be suspended for such incidents and to become recidivist and a significant number develop serious behavioural problems leading to incarceration. The students' academic social and behavioural skills need to be assessed and some individualization of programmes provided for in the policy. Student attitudes which reflect negative, uncaring and rejecting views about those being bullied must also be addressed in the policy. These will be reflected in responses to questions 6 and 8 in particular as they are asked how they respond to others being bullied.
ii) Parents

The policy should clarify the level and type of contact to be established which will empower parents to contribute to the development of a non-bullying school policy. Inclusion of parents in training and support programmes for children at the school is essential; and the provision of relevant programmes for parents also needs clarification. Their representation at the in-service day is to be encouraged as are their suggestions about availability to monitor students and assist at sporting and other events to provide a greater level of supervision. The team will need to carefully word their statements to ensure there is no confusion about the roles and responsibilities of parents and teachers. Fundamentally, it is the role and responsibility of the school to manage students while in their care and while it is important to keep parents informed of the interventions undertaken the responsibility for intervention remains with the school. Those students identified as bullies and those identified as victims of bullying need remediation and support of very kinds. The issue of parental responsibility for the management of their child’s behaviour needs to be discussed - including restitution/supervision/cooperation with school policy and behaviour management skilling. The policy needs to state what roles and responsibilities the school and parents share and which are separate. Supervision before and after school should be clarified particularly with regard to children living at some distance from the school. The allocation of such responsibility is paramount if out-of-school and out-of-home time periods are to be safe and appropriately spent.

Parents also need to understand the legislative mandates governing teachers' responses to reports of bullying and the notification of abuse and harm to individual students. This is a more serious approach to intervention but needs to be stated in the policy to, ensure students and parents are aware that teachers have no choice in the event of peer abusive behaviour but to report the incident for appropriate investigation and intervention outside the school. Provisions should be stated for consultation on an individual basis with parents of children (i) whose behaviour reflects a lack of compliance with the policy or (ii) whose children complain of being victims. The policy is specifically related to bullying so it is important to state the specific supports offered for bullying incidents, as well as the documentation and follow-up planned when such a process is put place.
iii) School personnel

The policy needs to clearly acknowledge the roles and responsibilities of school personnel involved in the development of this non-bullying culture. It is evident that the leadership provided by school professionals is an essential component of successful intervention. Teachers will be the main resource for students seeking assistance for bullying incidents, and it must be made clear in the policy document what they can expect in terms of responses from school personnel. There should be specific guidelines provided which all personnel are expected to comply with in order to ensure consistency of approach and intervention for all. The policy needs to include an acknowledgement and celebration of difference in the persons involved. Increasingly in the human services literature, the impact of different personality orientations is identified. With this in mind, introspective and exploratory workshops may need to be made available so that all parties can familiarize themselves with their own response patterns and those of others with whom they engage. It is important that the policy states that diversity in approach can be acceptable when results indicate that outcomes are consistent.

The following may also need to be considered:

*Induction/orientation programmes for staff.* Too often it is automatically assumed that staff appointed to schools will 'feel their way through' and absorb all of the philosophical nuances the school community has deliberately selected, adopted or developed. It is not fair to assume that the school community view is obvious or accessible and orientation/induction programmes can ensure that at least the foundation philosophy is available and understood. Such a programme could be delivered in a 'buddy' or 'mentor' partnership between established and new staff members. The development of teams to support colleagues and the opportunity for staff members to share their expertise and strategies with others, should be stated as a positive proposal in the policy for example a Grievance committee or Debriefing Team could be established.

*Multi-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary* considerations need to be identified. The composition of a consultative team including the school counsellor, itinerant support, learning support, school executive, teaching and other staff would be described here. In addition, outside agencies offering support programmes for students should have personnel listed as consultants or mentors in this part of the policy. Community involvements outside educational institutions, including church, business and volunteer organizations should be sought and incorporated into the policy.
C. PROGRAMMES, STRATEGIES AND SKILLS

Having determined that a range of approaches is necessary because of individual needs and orientations of teachers, students and others, the programmes section should identify major programme types:

i. Curricular programmes
ii. Preventative programmes and strategies
iii. Responsive programmes and strategies
iv. Administrative considerations.

as well as strategies available and skills necessary for all participants to develop a non-bullying attitude.

Obviously curriculum guidelines for delivery of content, basic competencies and skills in the key learning areas should be followed. However, if bullying and aggression are evident as problems in the school environment, teachers may need to reconsider the emphasis of their curriculum planning. In such a setting, a shift towards behavioural and social skills programmes as the major components of their teaching may need to be considered. If children have difficulty relating to each other and to staff then it seems unlikely they will satisfactorily complete academic assignments anyway. In addition, specific lessons which related to social skills development and behaviour skills for interpersonal interactions were presented daily.

School personnel need to re-think and to state in the policy for a non-bullying school, that the immediate emphasis for their teaching of particular students may not always be academic content and skills, and the necessity for this should be endorsed by the administration or executive. Teachers who need to manage difficult students' behaviour, should not be made to feel guilty because academic activities are given a reduced priority in some circumstances. This philosophy, included in the policy, supports teachers' attempts to teach the whole child, but at the same time has, as a foundation, acceptance of the notion that all three aspects of the child's needs are the responsibility of educators. Teachers need not necessarily deliver all three programme components alone - collaboration with support teachers and counsellors may be sought.
D. RESOURCES

A comprehensive list of the resources it can be anticipated will be available to support the policy should be included. This should represent a realistic appraisal of what is immediately available and what may be reasonably acquired, rather than a documentation of all possible resources. Indeed the resources section should be specifically designed to indicate acquisition or access plans for accumulating appropriate resources and these may be listed in a timeline or 1-2 year goal plan.

A degree of flexibility will need to be introduced in relation to class sizes and composition, timetables, staff distribution and duties, resources allocation etc. For example, an In-school Suspension programme, to be introduced effectively may require access to a room and furnishings, staff to operate the programme on a rotational basis, supervision to be increased etc. To authenticate the commitment of management to such bullying prevention initiatives provision of those basic resources would need to be forthcoming.

The structure of a policy for a non-bullying school should be a comprehensive document which specifies particulars for implementation of programmes and strategies and inclusion of personnel and resources. However, it should also be a reader-friendly, non-discriminatory and generally applicable policy in order that all members of the school community feel they have access to its contents. It should represent a cohesive view illustrated through a collage of approaches, strategies and processes, all of which contribute to a realistic policy for the maintenance of a non-bullying environment.

In order to ensure that the policy does not become 'shelved', a regular staff discussion of the document as it develops following construction, should be arranged. A regular segment at staff meetings, regular committee conventions and review of 'documentation', would contribute to a dynamic and viable policy.

The policy also needs to state the availability of information and the purpose to which it will be put in the event of bullying incidents. It is advisable that the Privacy and Personal Information Act 1999 be reviewed in this regard as the record-keeping needs to adhere to specific guidelines.
4.2 PROCEDURES AND DOCUMENTATION

This working party needs to review the suggestions made in the workshop notes and decide on the recording and reporting processes and procedures. It is also important to record in the policy statement the decisions taken in this regard by the relevant team. The workshop notes will identify the roles and responsibilities of various participants in the intervention and these should be recorded as part of the policy. In particular, where decisions have been stated about where, when and how reports are to be made and maintained, these should be stated in the policy. This makes it clear to all concerned the commitment of the school and the organisational structures to be put in place to enable that commitment. The roles and responsibilities of staff in relation to the procedures should be defined to facilitate the process of implementation. These issues are dealt with in the workshop sessions and should be reflected in the notes collected by this working party.

The strategies to be used for intervention will be discussed in the workshops and recorded for this team. Having determined that a range of strategies is available, access to these needs to be described, decisions made as to the preferred strategy for teachers own purposes and the types of documentation needs to be recorded. Concern that a single strategy should be used throughout the school should be replaced on the understanding that the outcomes for all strategies used should be consistent i.e. children who are safe, non-bullying, happy and making progress within individual classrooms. The availability of counselling, therapies and other support services needs to be identified.

This working party, in summary will consolidate the reporting and recording processes devised or suggested by each workshop team. They will make the final determination about the number, type and applications of a range of documentation and reporting procedures to ensure that bullying is not ignored.
4.3 PRODUCTS FOR DISPLAY AND DISTRIBUTION

Suggestions for the design and distribution of supporting products are presented on pages 41-42 in the guidelines for workshops and also in the products page for each workshop. They could include tangible articles students and community members as well as teachers can produce to express their support for victims and rejection of bullying.

Posters:
These posters could be displayed at intervals throughout the year—perhaps with a weekly focus on a particular type of bullying.

- design a poster listing the steps and options for intervention and protection within the school for all school community members.
- a poster or other form of notice to record timetable changes or duty rosters could be discussed or devised.
- consider the design of posters to be placed in strategic locations about the school to remind school community members about their personal responsibility for the safety and welfare of themselves and others.
- a poster to inform the school community about various aspects of bullying and/or the school policy in relation to such bullying, e.g. racial or ability—based bullying
- there could be a poster designed to inform the school community of the legal and school sanctions for verbal bullying.
- devise a poster to inform students of the availability of supports and procedures.
- devise a poster to inform all school community members what constitutes physical abuse and how to report it.

Devise a reporting form or procedure;

- devise a reporting form or procedure for reporting all bullying;
- devise a recording format for reporting of instances of bullying of those with disability and determine the process for maintaining such reports.
- devise a recording format for reporting of instances of racial bullying and determine the process for maintaining such reports.
- the format for recording the impact of the verbal abuse could be devised

Other products could include:

- a t-shirt logo,
- badge,
- pamphlet listing a student support team.
- a palm card may be designed for all student and school community members listing the steps to be taken in the event of bullying and the options for support.
- It may be useful to devise a certificate for awarding to those who have been to an outside organisation for experience with individuals with disability either on a voluntary or school—organised basis.
- Consider a student nomination form for identifying teachers who are particularly helpful and supportive in this area. E.g. “Bullybuster of the Week”;
- consider a contract to be signed by all teachers and other members of the school community to commit to accepting responsibility for intervention, offering support, responding appropriately, assisting students being bullied etc.
SECTION 5

ANTI-BULLYING CURRICULUM
AND TRAINING FOR ALL STUDENTS

5.1 PEER ADVOCACY TRAINING
5.1 Peer Advocacy - A Functional Response To Resisting Bullying: 
Structure and Processes.

Peer Advocacy represents an innovative and research-based approach to the preparation of young people for the shared responsibility of protection and support of their peers. This paper describes the functional components of the Peer Advocacy intervention. It locates the process of Peer Advocacy within the framework of a comprehensive approach to intervention in bullying in schools. It is implemented ideally within a supportive environment which acknowledges the damaging effects of peer abuse. It is embedded within the school-wide anti-bullying curriculum which assists young people to develop relevant personal competencies and interpersonal skills in preparation for the role of Peer Advocate. The theoretical underpinnings of Peer Advocacy as an intervention in bullying are described elsewhere, (Healey, in press) and are linked to original research which identified peer attitudes and competencies in relation to bullying.

The structure and processes of Peer Advocacy as a training program comprising a set of guiding principles, operational principles, knowledge and procedures related to the role of advocacy as a bullying intervention are described in detail here. The program equips young people with the skills, motivation and commitment to assist their bullied peers in the quest for protective intervention. The objective is for relevant personal attributes, specific knowledge and informed advocacy skills to be developed and demonstrated as a result of inclusion in the program. It is an innovative and advanced program of intervention reliant upon the courage, skill and tenacity of young people in defence of each other even when those in authority are unresponsive to the need for protection.

Peer Advocacy represents the establishment of a partnership which supports self-protective responses to abusive behaviour, not a dependent relationship whereby passivity is reinforced. The process of accessing and collaboration with a Peer Advocate are in themselves pro-active responses on the part of the victimised individual, which will assist in the development of further effective behaviours.
Peer Advocates are a means by which the case for the victim can be put to supportive and committed authority figures who have the power to intervene and change the circumstances whereby bullies have unlimited and unsupervised access to their victims. Without the establishment of such a structured process, victims are left to formulate their own responses to bullies, often with devastating psychological consequences. When schools commit to a thorough approach to intervention in bullying there is a need to identify as one component, a curriculum which will inform the whole school student population about the specific characteristics of the bullying paradigm. (see Figure 1). Peer Advocacy is one such program of information and education addressing commonly held misconceptions about bullying, identifying behaviours which indicate an individual may be a bully or may be a victim of bullying, and providing training in a range of interpersonal and personal competencies to support the advocacy process.

The program is not designed as an individual intervention for those who already show the signs of bullying or being the victims of bullying. The training is generic in the sense that it is intended to be delivered to all students in the selected cohort, the majority of whom will be neither bullies nor victims of bullying. It is essential that these students, who already have a solid understanding of acceptable behaviour, be included in a program with others who are less skilled so that the latter can benefit from the more advanced social and behavioural repertoires demonstrated by the majority. In this program, identified bullies are not excluded but are expected to undertake the same training procedure as other students. It is anticipated that during the process of training the attitudes and behaviours of bullies will be transformed towards more supportive interactions. It is also anticipated that during the course of the program individuals who appear to be victimised will be identified and will be assisted through their participation, to accept and adopt the more acceptable and effective behaviours presented. It may well be that this does not eventuate and some will require individual interventions concurrent with, or following their involvement in the program due to their continued bullying behaviour or victimisation.

In the first instance, however it is imperative that such individuals are not segregated from their competent peers, and that they be given every opportunity to develop appropriate skills and competencies within the mainstream of their educational setting.
STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES OF THE PEER ADVOCACY TRAINING PROGRAM

The program is designed as a series of units of study to be delivered as a complete program over a period of one school term in all likelihood through the health physical education, social justice or personal development curriculum areas. It is recommended that the students involved be from the middle or upper years of high school to ensure a measure of maturity and status. However it may be that the students most involved in the bullying paradigm need to be trained for supportive intervention during the most salient period of the problem. Bullying is endemic in the early years of high school and peers are less likely to hold supportive and empathetic views of the experiences of bullied individuals.

The program comprises units of study involving highly motivating and engaging activities and lessons with particular emphases related to bullying intervention. Figure 2 describes the structure of the phases and components of the Peer Advocacy Program. Fundamentally, the process of Peer Advocacy necessitates the training of young people in a series of procedures which facilitates their more effective assistance for peers who are the victims of bullying. These young people are not required to make judgements about the morality of the bully’s behaviour, nor are they commissioned to seek punishment or retribution on the victim’s behalf. The role of the Advocate is to support the victim of bullying in their efforts to receive assistance and intervention to recognise, resist and replace bullying in their lives.

Phases of Delivery

The program comprises three phases of delivery which delineate the level of competency and knowledge anticipated in participants. The phases are distinctively labelled to indicate to students their progress towards the full title and responsibility and the level of performance expected in terms of prerequisite skills and competencies. Initially, participants develop and successfully demonstrate competency of several personal capacities: introspection, empathy, resiliency, assertiveness and responsibility. Participants also acquire knowledge and information specific to bullying intervention and commit to accepting a level of responsibility for the protection of bullied peers. This occurs prior to attempting specific advocacy training with the purpose of attaining the responsible position of Peer Advocate.
Focus of the Phases of the Peer Advocacy Program

Preliminary Phase: Apprentice Peer Advocate
This phase addresses the development of Personal Attributes relevant to bullying intervention and focuses on learning about and demonstrating specific personal competencies which are relevant to the process of advocacy. These comprise: introspection, empathy, assertiveness, resiliency and responsibility. Participants must demonstrate the attribute in their daily lives and will achieve recognition, for the performance of activities which indicate their presence. Participants compile an achievement portfolio which is verified by parents, sports coaches, ministers and other significant people in the life of the individual so that all five attributes are confirmed. Students progress to the next phase upon completion. The program is designed to ensure that opportunities are created for the demonstration of these criterion-based competencies in a challenging but enjoyable way.

Intermediate Phase: Deputy Peer Advocate
This phase addresses Knowledge and Skills in relation to school, systemic, legal and community protective structures to be accessed in the event of the need for protective intervention. This phase begins to introduce the skills and behaviours to assist students to recognise and resist bullying and introduces knowledge and skills for effective protection and safety for themselves and others. Knowledge and commitment are required performance bases for this phase demonstrated in the production of a series of posters, pamphlets, booklets and other shared materials which identify bullying, commit to accepting responsibility for help-seeking, and disseminate knowledge about the school, community and legislative protections available for those who are being victimised in any way.

Advanced Phase: Peer Advocate
This phase addresses Advocacy Processes related to the capacity of the participant to implement prescribed and supported procedures to secure protection for those being bullied. It provides opportunities for the acquisition and demonstration of more advanced skills and intervention behaviours to assist students to replace bullying in their experiences, in their own and others’ interactions and to refine competencies for notification and intervention. This phase teaches the history and philosophy of advocacy. It also presents the guiding and operational principles of Peer Advocacy, as well as the procedures for consulting, documentation, reporting and intervention in bullying incidents. On completion of this phase trained Peer Advocates volunteer to act on behalf of those in need of protective intervention. It is at this point that the skills and strategies for support are implemented to protect others.
**Key Components Of The Peer Advocacy Intervention**

**Basic Premises**

Peer Advocacy is premised on empathy, responsibility, respect, objectivity, fairness, privacy and action. Peer Advocacy is premised on the need for persistent and patient help-seeking and support when assistance is not immediately forthcoming. Peer Advocates act as independent and ethical spokespersons for those in need of protective intervention because of peer abuse.

**Peer Advocates** demonstrate these qualities by:

- listening to or reading complaints about bullying and accepting their Validity.
- explaining the processes and procedures for the reporting of bullying and invocation of the advocacy process.
- offering a range of assistance options.
- acting as a go-between for the complainant with those in authority whose help is sought.
- encouraging the complainant to formalise their complaint and to seek help.
- accompanying the complainant to meetings with those in authority to explain the situation, describe the events and request intervention.
- maintaining ongoing help and support for the emotional and practical needs of the victim following the reporting of the events.
- speaking for the person represented if necessary.
- following the specified procedures for the reporting of bullying.
- focussing the advocacy sessions on the establishment of an intervention to the benefit of the person represented.

**Peer Advocates do not:**

- discuss the complaint with the individual identified as the bully.
- behave in a negative, rejecting or accusational manner towards the individual identified as the bully.
- discuss the complaint or related matters with others not involved in the issues.
- seek punishment or retribution on behalf of the complainant.
- investigate the complaints received.
- act on behalf of the complainant without their permission.
SECTION 6

INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTION:

6.1 ASSISTING VICTIMS TO DEVELOP RESILIENCY
   ASSERTIVENESS AND CONFIDENCE

6.2 ASSISTING BULLIES TO DEVELOP EMPATHY,
   TOLERANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY

6.3 OBSERVERS OF BULLYING
Characteristics of Victims, Bullies and Observing Peers

6.1 Assisting Victims to Develop Resiliency, Assertiveness and Confidence

There is a continuum of characteristics exhibited by victims of bullying (Besag, 1992, Olweus, 1993;) and while the personal interaction and response style of a victim may be deemed passive, ineffectual and lacking resilience, they can just as often be assertive and resistant in response to the bullying behaviour. Victims are not necessarily, as is popularly believed, weak and vulnerable individuals incapable of defending themselves against the aggressive demands of the bully. A critical component of victimization is the lack of support, assistance and empathy evident in their peers and others throughout their ordeal (Rigby, & Slee, 1993). Victims are selected on the basis of their perceived passivity and social ineptitude, and in the expectation there will be little resistance. Nevertheless, should they attempt to seek assistance and protection it is often the unsupportive social processes encountered following victimization which further incapacitate the victim. When their appeals for help and support are met with rejection and dismissive attitudes their victimisation is compounded.

The Peer Advocacy program provides an alternative voice which can verify the experiences of the victim and provided an appeal for assistance on their behalf when their own efforts are ignored. Victims of bullying in the school will be included in the Peer Advocacy program (or other selected anti-bullying intervention) and therefore skills in help-seeking and personal attributes such as resiliency and assertiveness will have been addressed for these individuals. Nevertheless, they may need individual intervention to overcome the effects of the bullying or to further develop the requisite skills and knowledge to ensure their own protection. Victims of bullying require support and practical intervention to facilitate such protective strategies as avoidance of the bully, immediate response to reports of bullying and a secure reporting mechanism.

The school will need to address these matters as a component of the overall plan for bullying intervention, but also as an individualised procedure depending on the circumstances of the victimisation. Punitive and exclusionary sanctions may need to be applied to the bully. However it is not appropriate to isolate the victim, for example by excluding them from the playground in an attempt to offer protection. The free and safe movement of the victim must be restored and maintained as a critical indicator of commitment to whole school intervention.
The school may also need to consider mandatory reporting legislative provisions particularly if the bullying experienced leads to physical and psychological harm which interferes with the victim's capacity to attend school, take part in activities etc. Very often bullying will be resolved through the whole–school curricular process since students are all introduced to appropriate attitudes and skills. However there is also the likelihood that serious bullying will need to dealt with quite differently to protect victims.

Figure 1 illustrates the gradual development of skills by the victim as an effective response to bullying. This follows the application of a research-based intervention program, delivered in an environment committed to bullying prevention through the provision of supports. It also describes the relative positions of the protagonists. At one end of the interaction continuum are those victims who are neither resilient nor assertive and who succumb to the harmful effects of the bullying virtually without any resistance. They do not have the social or interpersonal skills or confidence to resist the bully or seek help to stop the victimisation and they may well endure serious psychological and emotional damage as a result.

These victims of bullying can truly be classified as passive victims, and the prognosis without remedial intervention is bleak. Such individuals, without the benefit of genuine resilience nor acquired resiliency behaviours are often abandoned by non-abusive peers who lack sympathy for or empathy with their plight. (Healey 2001; Rigby, 1996). Their complaints are frequently dismissed as insignificant by those in authority with the power to intervene. This is often due to a misinterpretation of the interactions observed or reported. Teachers frequently and inappropriately identify bullying as play or fighting and fail to intervene or offer support or protection. Victims therefore struggle to cope in such unsupportive environments. While it is certainly true that bullies select their targets using specific criteria including the likelihood that they will encounter little or no resistance, they are also aware that their behaviour may well be interpreted as something other than bullying by those to whom the victim turns. The attitudes and indifference of those within the social milieu of the victim contribute substantially to the reinforcement of bullying behaviour.
FIGURE 1

MODEL OF INTERVENTION OUTCOMES FOR VICTIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BULLY ↔ reciprocal/consensual ↔</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOCATIVE VICTIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period of intervention/anti-bullying program delivered in supportive environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffective victimisation</td>
<td>PEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVE VICTIM</td>
<td>MARKET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilation of skills</td>
<td>RESILIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESISTANT VICTIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice of skills</td>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSIVE VICTIM</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective victimisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Development of effective responses following period of intervention in a supportive environment which facilitates guided development, practice and assimilation of effective resistant behaviours
When victims of bullying demonstrate some defensive skills such as protestations to the bully, seeking peer support and early stage reporting behaviour (Healey 2001) they can be described as **defensive victims**. These individuals are further along the continuum of effectiveness in response to bullying and are beginning to develop a level of assertiveness. If, through the application of an instructional intervention they can be given the opportunity to practice such skills, their capacity for resistance will improve as will their determination to secure the support to which they are entitled. Victims of bullying who can be classified as defensive make stronger attempts to assert their desire to be left alone and to be assisted to avoid or prevent the bullying behaviour. These individuals require further training in effective skills of resistance such as reporting and self-advocacy, but can develop a foundation of assertiveness and some resiliency in continuing to resist the bully despite minimal support in the social milieu. It is at this juncture that the Peer Advocacy program described elsewhere (Healey, 1997) can be incorporated to offer a further level of assistance and support for victims.

The **resistant victim** whose resiliency has been developed through the program of intervention, and whose responses are therefore more effective, will have more success in diverting the bully and recovering from the victimisation. While receiving instructional intervention these skills are practised and reinforced to facilitate implementation in bullying situations. It must be remembered, however that the effectiveness of the victim is not simply a function of their skills, but a combination of their resistance within effective protective environments which have established codes for responding to complaints about bullying.

The **effective victim** will emerge when the period of intervention within such an environment leads to the assimilation of effective skills, more sustained assertive responses and ultimately resiliency. Victimisation may not cease but these victims will have acquired more effective strategies for coping. Normalisation of relationships between the bully and the victim will result in neutral co-habitation whereby each individual functions without inappropriate interactions. Avoidance of the bully, sustained resistance and resiliency will enable this to occur. The bully must also be involved in an individual intervention to normalise their behaviour towards appropriate peer interactions.
There is a final category of victim included in Figure 1 and placed separately from the passive-defensive-resistant-effective paradigm of victims who are genuinely enduring involuntary negative and harmful interactions with a bullying individual. The provocitive victim cannot be placed on the same continuum as the latter victims since the behaviour in which provocitive victims engage is similar to, though obviously less effective than, the aggressive behaviour of the bully. This individual is described as a 'victim' simply because the outcome of their provocitive behaviour is negative for them, as opposed to the outcome of aggressive behaviour for the bully which is generally positive for them. We need to consider the provocitive victim more as a failed bully than as a genuine victim. The behaviours of the provocitive victim include name-calling, tormenting, interference and general nuisance-causing and often lead to negative physical consequences. These individuals are not passive in the face of the responses they receive and promptly complain about their victimisation and hurt. (Rigby, 1996). Provocitive victims are identified by vigilant teachers who observe the interactions provoked by their behaviours, and while assistance cannot be denied to these or any other individuals harmed by others, there is a different paradigm altogether in the relationship between the provocitive and the passive victim and the bully.

The essential difference between passive and provocitive victims is the reciprocity of the behaviour—a key discriminating factor in identifying bullying. As discussed earlier, bullying is not play and it is not fighting, even though bullies often use these terms to justify their behaviours. The critical component of the bully-victim paradigm is the lack of reciprocity in the behaviour. This, of course is the defining factor in the provocitive victim-bully paradigm whereby both participants are engaging in mutually harmful behaviours. This becomes an important factor when intervention is considered since provocitive victims do not require instruction in the same skills as passive or resistant victims.
Provocative victims engage in aggressive behaviour and need instruction in appropriate interaction behaviours just as bullies do, while passive victims need assistance to develop more resilient, less passive behaviours. In terms of resiliency, then, the experience of bullying necessitates instruction in resistance and self-protective behaviours particularly for those individuals who do not exhibit natural resistance to the abuse. The model presented here indicates that victims of bullying may possess or develop varying degrees of resistance and coping strategies but are nevertheless victimised. For those individuals for whom resistance is difficult, and therefore for whom resiliency is also difficult to demonstrate, more intensive intervention over a longer period will be necessary.
Individual Intervention for Victims

Resiliency training

It is often stated or assumed that bullying somehow assists the growth of 'character', 'manliness' and resilience. This notion is usually only applied to bullying of vulnerable children and young people, however, and it is rarely suggested that adults could benefit in the same way from bullying in their personal or work relationships. It is important to consider that irrespective of the degree of resiliency demonstrated by the victim, the emotional impact of bullying is likely to remain substantial. Resilient behaviours are demonstrated despite the distress experienced not as an alternative response to it. Some individuals will couple the emotional pain with overtly effective behavioural responses (resiliency) while others will respond in an ineffective, non-resilient manner along with the distress. The level of resilience evident in the overt behaviours does not indicate the level of emotional impact and this is a critical factor in intervention in bullying. Victims of bullying who respond in a more proactive and self-protective manner should not be viewed as less damaged than those who are incapable of demonstrating effective help-seeking responses. Resilient behaviours do not preclude emotional damage and depression (Luthar, 1997) and the danger is that apparently resilient individuals will be less well supported and indeed may be excluded from, or denied intervention to halt the abuse on the basis of their more competent social responses. This can increase the emotional impact and lead to re-victimisation through the withholding of support and intervention.

The way in which bullying behaviours are perceived and acknowledged, however, often determines the degree of persistence and ultimate effectiveness of victims. In an unprotected and unreceptive environment where efforts to resist bullying through, for example reporting or escape are thwarted, ignored or even punished, resilience will not develop and the stress may well be multiplied. Dubrow, Roecker & De Imperio (1997) similarly explore risk and protective mechanisms which contribute to adjustment and resilience in children and adolescents, with an emphasis on interventions which promote competence in young people. These theorists believe that resiliency can be developed through the acquisition of resilient behaviours taught through an appropriate intervention.
Wills, Blechman & McNamara (1996) offer further support for a competency-based model for the development of resiliency in their discussion of the impact of family and social supports and the contribution of these to coping and competence in young people. The purpose of developing resistant behaviours is not to deny the impact of the bullying behaviour but to provide an interim response which may divert the bully and thereby give some relief from stress temporarily. Victims need to behave as though they are resilient in order to secure relief from the victimisation.

Resiliency may be incorporated as a set of teachable skills in an intervention designed to assist young people to resist and recover from bullying. Teaching resiliency could be a critical component of intervention in bullying and the efforts of several researchers in teaching such skills support the view that such an approach is viable. Dubow et al (1997), suggest the school environment is the most effective and efficient place in which to introduce interventions for young people at risk because of access, the range of professional skills available and the social expectation that training and information will be provided. Their belief that behaviour change and management are expectations of the profession is echoed by other researchers and theorists (Sulzer-Azaroff & Mayer 1977), and society views the large resource allocation to education services as providing the scaffold for ethical and responsible intervention.

Several programs have been devised which have been targeted at developing resiliency or component skills. Dubow et al (1997) "I CAN DO" project was devised to enhance social problem-solving skills and provides a six step response to challenging situations requiring the young person to focus on practical and possible solutions. A key factor in the relevance of this program to the development of the current intervention is the inclusion of peer support strategies to mediate the distress of the situations encountered. This research indicated that outcomes were sustained at a five month follow-up and children were able to apply the coping strategies learned in scenarios representing various stressful situations, given peer and social supports. The nominated skills reflect capacities other researchers have identified as typical of resilient individuals including management of affect through discussion, cognitive introspection and focus; deliberate choices of responses and effective implementation in simulated situations.
6.2 Assisting Bullies to Develop Empathy, Tolerance and Responsibility

Bullies are not necessarily viewed as aggressive individuals whose pattern of interaction is based on demanding, selfish and destructive behaviours designed to maintain their self esteem at the expense of others’. Society seems to view bullies often as successful leaders in a competitive environment where aggression is a justifiable means to a lucrative and indulged future. (McCarthy, Sheehan & Wilkie, 1996). Bullies are described in glowing terms as popular, attractive, having lots of friends, wealth, power and ability (Jenkin, 1999). It is these very characteristics which society so values, and which bullies are so skilled at emulating, which places them in a position to wield such destructive influence over their victims. Less attractive, less popular, less flamboyant and far less socially impressive victims cannot muster support for their complaints against such charismatic individuals.

Bullies will be included in the whole school anti-bullying curricular intervention such as Peer Advocacy, and through this should become familiar with social expectations with regard to abusive behaviour. The Peer Advocacy program assists in the development of personal attributes such as introspection whereby bullies can examine their own behaviour and attitudes, empathy during which they have the opportunity to take the perspective and role of others in difficult situations and responsibility when they are exposed to a range of circumstances which relate their level of personal and social responsibility. They are also trained to recognise bullying and to understand the school level as well as legal and social sanctions applicable for physically and psychologically abusive behaviour. It is anticipated that such a range of educational and training experiences would provide the foundation for socially responsible behaviour. However there are likely to be individuals for whom this approach is not sufficient to change their behaviour and attitudes and who require individual remedial intervention.
The introduction of a therapeutic, remedial and if necessary punitive intervention to assist these individuals to develop appropriate skills must be considered. It is unrealistic to believe that there should be no blame or punitive sanctions applied to bullies.

Bullies and provocative victims who engage in aggressive and abusive behaviour will benefit from an individual intervention which leads them along a continuum towards more acceptable behaviour. The program of intervention should incorporate elements which permit them to learn to differentiate aggressive from assertive behaviours. However it must be recognised that the bullying behaviour is far more rewarding for such individuals and is difficult to replace. Bullies are no doubt assertive individuals already which facilitates their self-protective denials and protestations when reported as bullying. Nevertheless, it will be an important function of the school intervention to identify inappropriate behaviours and notify these to the bully along with the prescribed sanctions determined within the school.

Education and remediation are the preferred options for intervention, but the safety of victims is paramount and if the reported behaviour is having serious physical or psychological impact the bully must be removed from access to the victim. Bullies may be isolated from their peers through regular educational processes such as detention and withdrawal, however these periods of isolation should be used to remediate behaviour and teach appropriate skills not merely to punish. Other means of denying access once the bully has been identified and shown to be engaging in abusive peer behaviour may include: adjusting recess periods so that the bully does not have unsupervised access to the victim during school recreation periods; adjusting travel arrangements to ensure the safe travel of the victim to and from school; altering arrangements for movement around the school between classes to restrict opportunities for bullying and removing bullies from positions of authority or status such as sports team leadership, prefect or other status role which affords them the opportunity to bully.

These are serious and controversial decisions to be taken but if the school has developed a comprehensive intervention and has documented their agreed position in the policy statement, fair application of the process is possible. In the majority of cases these procedures will not be necessary however the school community must be prepared to undertake agreed sanctions to validate the intervention.
Figure 2 illustrates the purpose and focus of the intervention for bullies. The critical factor is to move them from aggressive and harmful interactions with peers to co-operative or neutral relationships. Bullies, as with other individuals cannot be expected to be friends with all their peers and indeed most peer relationships are neutral. The outcome of the intervention indicates movement and development from bullying behaviour through the acquisition of assertive, empathetic and co-operative interaction behaviours. These of course must be measured and assessed to determine the presence of the appropriate interaction skills. The process is predicated upon prior baseline measures of attitudes and behaviours indicating bullying and comparative measures following individual intervention to assess the acquisition of new strategies ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BULLY</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOCATIVE VICTIM</td>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer victimisation</td>
<td>ASSERIVE PEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice of skills</td>
<td>EMPATHIC PEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilation of skills</td>
<td>INTERACTIVE PEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period of intervention/anti-bullying program delivered in supportive environment</td>
<td>PEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 OBSERVERS OF BULLYING

The impact on bystanders and peers observing bullying has often, to date been discussed in terms of concern for their emotional responses. However, it is suggested in this program that 'bystanders' be replaced with a paradigm which places peer observers of bullying within the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVER BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>POSITIVE / HELPFUL</th>
<th>NEGATIVE / HARMFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>verbal and physical</td>
<td>verbal support for bully;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assistance to victim;</td>
<td>prevention of protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reporting to authorities;</td>
<td>intervention by others;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expressed disapproval of bullying behaviour</td>
<td>expressed approval of bullying behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>remaining in vicinity of victim; mentally noting names of bullies and details of the events</td>
<td>turning away; leaving the vicinity; failing to report;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>failing to offer verbal &amp; physical assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Matrix of observer responses when witnessing bullying.

It is clear that observers of bullying incidents are involved to some extent whatever their selected responses. Bystanders cannot be viewed as neutral observers of abusive behaviour towards others. They must respond in some way to the incidents observed and the matrix suggests that these responses can be positive or negative in their impact as well as active or passive in their execution. Doing 'nothing' is nevertheless responding in a manner which impacts the victim. This could include turning away, leaving the vicinity of the incident and failing to report.
This is therefore a passive and negative response to witnessing bullying. Observers who are passive in the sense of not actively engaging in overt behaviour can nevertheless contribute positively by remaining nearby and perhaps mentally noting the details of the incident. Those bystanders who actively support the bully or prevent protective intervention by others are engaging in negative and harmful behaviours akin to victimisation. The most effective and collaborative role for the observer of bullying is to engage in positive and helpful behaviours such as reporting, offering assistance, expressing disapproval to bullies and help-seeking. Peer Advocacy aims to develop these skills as well as courage and a sense of responsibility in those who witness bullying incidents. This requires training in perspective-taking as well as specific help-seeking skills. Observers of bullying are therefore suitable candidates for the Peer Advocacy program, as are all other peers who become aware of victimisation. Peer Advocacy relies upon peers of the victimised individual taking responsibility for seeking support and protection on their behalf. Young people are trained to understand and operate the procedures necessary for the victim of bullying to receive a fair hearing from the adults, in particular teachers, with the authority to intervene. Peer Advocates are expected to put the case for and with their partners to adults whose receptivity and responses reinforce the practice. In many instances, however, currently schools often do not have a supportive or systematic approach to dealing with complaints about bullying. In terms of individual intervention, peers who cannot accept a level of responsibility for reporting bullying may need to be included in instructive programs.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. SURVEY FORM/COUNTRY CODES

APPENDIX 2. DATA RECORDING FORMS

APPENDIX 3. WORKSHOP ENVELOPE LABELS

APPENDIX 4. POWERPOINT PRESENTATION CD
Thank you for filling out this survey. Your answers will be reported in such a way that you will not be able to be identified.

1. Year Level

2. Are you (please tick) Male ☐ Female ☐

3. What is the: country of your birth __________________________
   country of your mother's birth __________________________
   country of your father's birth __________________________

4. Have any of the following behaviours ever happened to you at this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once or more a day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Being teased or called names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Receiving comments about your family, your country of birth or religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Left out of things on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hit, punched or kicked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Forced to give money or belongings to someone without wanting to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Comments on the way you look</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Touched in ways you don't want to be touched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Personal property eg. bag, locker damaged or disturbed on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Would you describe bullying and harassment at this school as (circle one number)

Not a problem 1 2 3 4 5 6 A major problem

6. a. If a friend told you that they were being bullied or picked on by somebody from this school or a group of others, what would you suggest they do?

   ____________________________________________

b. Would you report it to a teacher Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Who gets bullied at this school?  

_________________________________________


d. Who is a bully at this school?  

_________________________________________

7. Do you think this school helps students feel good about themselves? (Circle one number)  

1  2  3  4  

Very few feel good  All feel good  

8. Are you willing to help somebody you see being bullied?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  

If Yes, how?  

_________________________________________

If No, why not?  

_________________________________________

9. Suggest ways we can help stop bullying/harassment in the school.  

_________________________________________

10. Place crosses beside any areas of the school where you think students feel unsafe.  
(You may choose one or more boxes)  

Classroom.................. ☐  Toilets ....................... ☐  
Library .................... ☐  Quadrangle.................. ☐  
Hall ........................ ☐  Playground ...................... ☐  
Corridors ................... ☐  Basketball Courts .......... ☐  
Change rooms .............. ☐  Bus ................................. ☐  
Walking or travelling to school...... ☐  
Others:  

_________________________________________

Comment on any personal experiences with bullying/harassment at school or on the way to or from school:

_________________________________________

_________________________________________
### SCHOOL SAFETY SURVEY

**COUNTRY OF BIRTH CATEGORIES AND CODES**

Countries named by survey participants as their country of birth or the country of birth of a parent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ASIAN</th>
<th>2. MIDDLE EASTERN</th>
<th>3. EASTERN EUROPEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. EUROPEAN</th>
<th>5. HISPANIC</th>
<th>6. AUSTRALIAN/NEW ZEALAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Channel Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. PACIFIC ISLANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 AMERICAN/CANADIAN

9. AFRICAN/CARIBBEAN

- Ethiopia
- Ghana
- Kenya
- South Africa
- Trinidad
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Zaire
- Zimbabwe

10. INDIAN

- Bangladesh
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Sri Lanka
- Tibet
DATA RECORDING FORMS
RECORDING FORMS FOR SCHOOL DATA ANALYSIS

The forms which follow are devised to facilitate the recording and simple analysis of school data. The information to be recorded on the forms is taken directly from the survey sheets completed by students. The data can be analysed by gender, year level cultural background and bullied status to enable the school to pinpoint areas for intervention. It is proposed that the work of data analysis be shared by as many members of the school staff and community as are willing to contribute so that the information is widely known and ownership and responsibility established early in the intervention. Directions for completion of the forms are discussed in 1.2 pages 29-34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7 COMMENTS ON 4.8 DAMAGED NAME CALLING PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 FORCED TO GIVE GOODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 HIT, KICKED, PUNCHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 THREATENED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 LEFT OUT ON PURPOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 COMMENTS ON FAMILIAR/GROUP PURPOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 TEASED/NAME CALLING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>5 daily or more per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL STUDENTS:</th>
<th>DATA RECORDING FORM 4 SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4: TYPES/INTENSITY OF BULLYING</th>
<th>YEAR 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td>4.1 TEASED/NAME CALLING</td>
<td>4.2 COMMENTS ON FAMIL/RELIG/COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. daily or more than once per day</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. most days</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. weekly</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS: 5+4+3</td>
<td>total number bullied</td>
<td>% bullied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
## Survey Responses to Question 4: Types/Intensity of Bullying

### Year 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>4.1 Teased/Name Calling</th>
<th>4.2 Comments on Famili/Religi/Country</th>
<th>4.3 Left Out on Purpose</th>
<th>4.4 Threatened Hit, Kicked, Punched</th>
<th>4.5 Forced to Give Goods</th>
<th>4.6 Comments on Looks</th>
<th>4.8 Damaged Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Daily or more than once per day</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most days</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weekly</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals:
- Total number bullied
- % bullied

---

**MacArthur Model for Comprehensive Intervention in Bullying in Schools**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL STUDENTS:</th>
<th>DATA RECORDING FORM 4</th>
<th>SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4: TYPES/INTENSITY OF BULLYING</th>
<th>YEAR 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 TEASED/NAME CALLING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 daily or more than once per day</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td>4.2 COMMENTS ON FAMIL/RELIG/COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. most days</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td>4.3 LEFT OUT ON PURPOSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. weekly</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td>4.4 THREATENED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 HIT, KICKED, PUNCHED, ETC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+4+3</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td>4.6 FORCED TO GIVE GOODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 COMMENTS ON LOOKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 DAMAGED PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL STUDENTS:</th>
<th>DATA RECORDING FORM 4. SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4 : TYPES/INTENSITY OF BULLYING</th>
<th>YEAR 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td>4.1 TEASED/NAME CALLING</td>
<td>4.2 COMMENTS ON FAMIL/RELIG/COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. daily or more than once per day</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. most days</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. weekly</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong>:</td>
<td>total number bullied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5+4+3</strong></td>
<td>% bullied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL STUDENTS:</th>
<th>DATA RECORDING FORM 4. SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4: TYPES/INTENSITY OF BULLYING</th>
<th>YEAR 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td>4.1 TEASED/NAMED CALLING</td>
<td>4.2 COMMENTS ON FAMIL/RELIG/COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. daily or more than once per day</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. most days</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. weekly</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS: 5+4+3</td>
<td>total number bullied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUM:</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA RECORDING FORM 5 SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 5: HOW BIG A PROBLEM IS BULLYING?

1= NOT A PROBLEM  2= MINOR PROBLEM  3= MODERATE PROB.  4= SERIOUS PROB.  5= SEVERE PROB.  6= MAJOR PROBLEM

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL NO</th>
<th>NUM</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>MAYBE /DEPENDS</th>
<th>FEMALES YES</th>
<th>FEMALES NO</th>
<th>FEMALES MAYBE / DEPENDS</th>
<th>MALES YES</th>
<th>MALES NO</th>
<th>MALES MAYBE / DEPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAYBE/DEPENDS</td>
<td>FEMALES YES</td>
<td>FEMALES NO</td>
<td>FEMALES MAYBE</td>
<td>MALES YES</td>
<td>MALES NO</td>
<td>MALES MAYBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 7</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 8</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 9</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 10</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 11</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 12</td>
<td>NUM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING IN SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>10.1 CLASSRM NUM: %</th>
<th>10.2 LIBRARY NUM: %</th>
<th>10.3 HALL NUM: %</th>
<th>10.4 CORRIDORS NUM: %</th>
<th>10.5 CHANG/RMS NUM: %</th>
<th>10.6 WALK/TRAV NUM: %</th>
<th>10.7 TOILETS NUM: %</th>
<th>10.8 QUAD. NUM: %</th>
<th>10.9 PLAYGRND NUM: %</th>
<th>10.10 BSKETBCRT NUM: %</th>
<th>10.11 BUS NUM: %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NUMBER

TOTAL %

MACARTHUR MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION IN BULLYING
WORKSHOP ENVELOPE LABELS
WORKSHOP 1
ENVELOPE LABEL
TEACHER PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

DATA REQUIRED: YEAR 7-12 QUESTION 6A, 6B, 7, 9, 10

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________
6. ____________________________________________
7. ____________________________________________
8. ____________________________________________
9. ____________________________________________
10. ____________________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:
WORKSHOP 2
ENVELOPE LABEL
STUDENT PERSONAL SKILLS

DATA: REQUIRED YEAR 7-12 QUESTION 6A, 7, 8

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
WORKSHOP 3
ENVELOPE LABEL
VERBAL BULLYING

DATA: REQUIRED YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS 4.1,4.2,4.4,4.6,4.7; Q5;

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ________________________________________
2. ________________________________________
3. ________________________________________
4. ________________________________________
5. ________________________________________
6. ________________________________________
7. ________________________________________
8. ________________________________________
9. ________________________________________
10. _______________________________________  

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
WORKSHOP 4
ENVELOPE LABEL
PHYSICAL BULLYING

DATA REQUIRED YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 4.9, 5, 6C, 6D,

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. __________________________________
2. __________________________________
3. __________________________________
4. __________________________________
5. __________________________________
6. __________________________________
7. __________________________________
8. __________________________________
9. __________________________________
10. __________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:
WORKSHOP 5
ENVELOPE LABEL
CULTURAL or RACIAL BULLYING

DATA REQUIRED: YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS 3, Q 4.1, 4.2, 4.7, Q 9 Current school harassment policy

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________
7. ________________________________
8. ________________________________
9. ________________________________
10. ________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________
WORKSHOP 6
ENVELOPE LABEL
ABILITY-BASED BULLYING

DATA REQUIRED: YEARS 7-12 QUESTIONS Q 4, Q 5, Q7, Q8,

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________
7. ________________________________
8. ________________________________
9. ________________________________
10. _______________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:
________________________________
________________________________
WORKSHOP 7
ENVELOPE LABEL
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

DATA: YEARS 7-12  QUESTION 10, 4.9,

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ________________________________________
2. ________________________________________
3. ________________________________________
4. ________________________________________
5. ________________________________________
6. ________________________________________
7. ________________________________________
8. ________________________________________
9. ________________________________________
10. ________________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS: ___________________________
WORKSHOP 7
ENVELOPE LABEL
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

DATA: YEARS 7-12  QUESTION 10,4,9,

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________
7. ________________________________
8. ________________________________
9. ________________________________
10. ________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:

__________________________

__________________________
WORKSHOP 8
ENVELOPE LABEL
OUT-OF-CLASS SUPERVISION

DATA YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 4.9, 6B, 8, 9, 10

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________
6. ______________________________
7. ______________________________
8. ______________________________
9. ______________________________
10. ______________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:

________________________________________________________________________
WORKSHOP 9
ENVELOPE LABEL
DOCUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

DATA YEARS 7-12, QUESTIONS 6A, 6B, 7, 9, 10

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

6. 

7. 

8. 

9. 

10. 

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:

________________________________________

________________________________________
WORKSHOP 10
ENVELOPE LABEL
STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERVENTION

DATA YEARS 7-12; QUESTIONS 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 7, 8, 9, 10

NAMES OF TEAM:
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________
6. ____________________________________________
7. ____________________________________________
8. ____________________________________________
9. ____________________________________________
10. ____________________________________________

NOTES:

LEADER CONTACT DETAILS:
______________________________________________
______________________________________________
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

PRESENTER’S NOTES

A MANUAL FOR COMPREHENSIVE AND CUSTOMISED INTERVENTION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

JEAN B. HEALEY
Welcome staff, community members and students. Explain that this in-service day is an important component of the overall school intervention to intervene in bullying. Explain the procedure as comprising a Powerpoint presentation of general information about issues, types, myths and statistical data regarding bullying and then a session during which the data gathered at the school recently will be discussed as a whole group. After lunch there will be workshop sessions in which everyone can contribute to the development of school policy, procedures and interventions in bullying at the school.
Read the poem as you reveal each line and explain that although this was written by an English victim it seems to describe a typical playground scene and typical playground fear.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

Understanding Bullying

- RECENT AND TRAGIC INCIDENTS
- CROSSBOW INCIDENT IN NSW HIGH SCHOOL: A year 9 student brought a crossbow to school with the intention of 'frightening' his ex-girlfriend. He shot her through the chest with the arrow then lodging in the leg of another student nearby. He claimed to have been severely bullied over a long period of time and the ridicule he faced after breaking up with the girl was the impetus for his act. He received a jail term of 9 years.
- STABBING AT LOCAL MALL: A young male student left high school as a result of severe bullying which had lead to his hospitalisation from school on three occasions. He encountered his tormentors outside a shopping mall and, fearful of further bullying, purchased a set of kitchen knives while in the mall. When approached by the bullies on leaving the complex he stabbed one boy twice while being assaulted. He received a good behaviour bond and successfully sued the Department of School Education for failing to provide a safe environment while he was at school.
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Read out the tragic events all of which are real and fully documented. The crossbow tragedy occurred near Newcastle, NSW in 2003 and the youth charged used Molotov cocktails as well as the crossbow to ensure his victim was suitably fearful; the stabbing event occurred in Parramatta NSW in 1999;
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

Understanding Bullying

- RECENT AND TRAGIC INCIDENTS
- In New Zealand in 2003 a young man left his home in the early hours of the morning and rode his bicycle over a cliff to escape the taunting text messages of school peers. He had a medical condition which caused facial deformity and this made him a target of peer abuse.
- In the UK a bullied 13 year old boy spent 3 days in a coma after taking an overdose of medication to avoid the abuse of four older boys who ridiculed him for going to church and called him a ‘queer’.
- A seven year old African child at school in England was persistently abused by white girls. She developed bed-wetting and nightmares and was severely hurt by trying to bleach her skin.
- A plump girl in an Irish school was ridiculed about her size by abusive peers. She attempted to fight one of them and died after plunging through a wooden fence.

The young victim in Auckland was in his third year at high school and had been receiving messages and taunts for a considerable time. His mother did not know he had left the house in the early hours to commit suicide; the following three examples are quoted in Brendon Byrne’s book ‘Coping with bullying’, 1993 and are based in the UK.
This diagram explains where the in-service day fits in the overall scheme of intervention. It follows the collection of data, and provides the information necessary for an understanding of the state of the problem in the school. Explain that it was important to collect the data before staff or students could be given information about bullying, since an important indicator of the need for intervention is the expression of inaccurate beliefs and attitudes about bullying. Data collection will reveal that individuals believe that victims should not be helped as they should be able to ‘take care of themselves—a belief based in the view that bullying is actually fighting and they should be able to ‘stick up for themselves’. This is a common misconception among student peers. Of course bullying is abuse, not conflict and victims need assistance and support to overcome its effects.

During the in-service day workshops will enable participants to engage with the school data and contribute to intervention plans.
This is an introductory exercise to lighten the atmosphere and attempt to engage and interact with participants. They can reveal to a partner or nearby colleague when they have been 'wimp'. It is useful to have a few simple examples such as facing the height or speed of a fairground ride etc to illustrate your own wimp responses. It is best not to insist that participants reveal publicly anything that may embarrass them. Suffice to say we all fit along this continuum at certain points in our lives.
### Understanding Bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>WIMP</th>
<th>BULLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain that in fact the behaviours illustrated by the responses are as indicated and are often accompanied by the listed emotions. This introduces the power differential between victims and bullies but at the same time reinforces that the victim may well be assertive and confident in other circumstances.
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Understanding Bullying - Definitions

DEFINING BULLYING:

BULLYING IS DEFINED BY THE FREQUENCY OF THE BEHAVIOUR:
* repeated over days/weeks or more frequently
* not episodic or occasional

BULLYING IS DEFINED BY THE TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR:
* verbal, physical, psychological
* overt/obvious
* Inclusive/exclusive

BULLYING IS DEFINED BY THE INTENTION OF THE BULLY
* hurtful/harmful/intimidating
* deliberate
* often minimised by bully

BULLYING IS DEFINED BY LACK OF RECIPROCITY:
* not play, not fighting, not conflict

BULLYING IS DEFINED BY THE POWER IMBALANCE:
* mismatch in physical attributes
* dominance in social status or position
* dominant psychological attitudes
* dominant behaviour

Read through broad definitions. These factors feature in most published definitions.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

understanding Bullying- Definitions

- A student is being bullied or victimised when he or she is exposed repeatedly over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. (Olweus, 1993)
- Bullying is repeated aggression, verbal, psychological or physical conducted by an individual or group against others. (Byrne, 1993)
- Bullying is repeated aggression, psychological or physical, of a less powerful person by a more powerful person or group of persons. (Rigby, 1996)
- Bullying is a behaviour which can be defined as the repeated attack—physical, psychological, social or verbal by those in a position of power which is formally or situationally defined on those who are powerless to resist with the intention of causing distress for their own gain or gratification. (Besag, 1994)

Read and discuss the components of these definitions:
one or more students; repetition

Types of bullying

Power element

Introduces the idea of formal/ institutionalised (authority) bullying as well as advantageous or circumstantial bullying
Valerie Besag adds more detail to her definition and this assists in clarifying elements.
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Understanding Bullying- Definitions

- Bullying involves the repeated, intentionally harmful, psychological or physical actions of one or more socially powerful individuals against an individual who cannot effectively resist and who does not reciprocate the actions.

- JEAN B. HEALEY, 2003

The definition composed by the author taking into account all current elements and adding the notion of the lack of reciprocity (conflict) and the ineffectiveness of resistance in particular social circumstances. This would include schools where reports of bullying are ignored or seen as an opportunity to urge victims to 'help themselves'.
Read from the overhead and discuss each point but not necessarily in the order presented.

We must believe reports of bullying

While children do enjoy the rough and tumble of PLAY bullying is neither play nor enjoyable—it is abusive.

The resiliency argument holds true for many experiences of life during which we do learn to cope with disappointments. However, nobody should be expected to accept abuse as a component of the everyday lives. It is not likely to be a growth experience and young people must be protected from abuse if not from life’s usual disappointments.

Blaming the victim is unfair but common (see survey results).

Bullying is serious, highly destructive and commonplace.

Play myth again

Notification procedures must be formalised

Bullies have high social status and power as a general rule and certainly do not need to have their self-esteem boosted.
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understanding Bullying - Indicators

■ VICTIMS
■ disclosure
■ classroom indicators:
  ■ deterioration in work
  ■ loss of work/books/equipment
  ■ damage to books/equipment
  ■ isolation by peers
  ■ rejection by peers
  ■ desire to remain near the teacher
  ■ fearful of speaking out in class
  ■ subdued demeanour
  ■ crying/distressed/unhappy/fearful
  ■ made fun of by peers

Read and discuss indicators
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Understanding Bullying - Indicators

- VICTIMS
- playground indicators
  - isolation
  - involvement in altercations or "fights" but usually come off worst
  - physically abused by peers
  - derogatory nickname or name calling
  - have belongings taken, destroyed or "lost"
  - not included or selected in play
  - cuts, bruises, injuries and torn clothing following break times
  - anxiety at break times
  - seclusion in isolated areas or prefers library or other haven
  - no close friends

Read and discuss indicators
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Understanding Bullying - Indicators

- BULLY
- disclosure
- classroom indicators
  - able to dominate others
  - assertive to aggressive in interactions with teachers
  - may be older or physically bigger than peers
  - may brag about strength, toughness
  - low frustration levels - temper outbursts
  - average to good self-esteem
  - reject rules
  - accesses other students' work/belongings
  - verbally challenging teacher and peers

Read and discuss indicators
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
Understanding Bullying - Types

- TYPES OF BULLYING BEHAVIOURS
- Exclusion:
  - ignoring, isolating, excluding deliberately and for the purpose of damaging the victim
  - may include note-writing, messages on walls and other public places
  - may also involve slander and gossip about the victim
- Intimidation:
  - aggressive body language, posturing, use of body and voice in a threatening way
  - giving the 'look'
  - abusive phone calls/text messages/email

Read and discuss types
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

Understanding Bullying - Types

■ BULLYING OF TEACHERS
  ▪ all of the identified types of bullying behaviour can be systematically applied to
    members of the school staff by students or parents or colleagues
  ▪ in particular threats to the privacy of staff involving their sexual orientation
    and family are reported

■ BULLYING BY TEACHERS:
  Teachers are rarely mentioned by students as bullies. However, teacher
  behaviours which may be interpreted as bullying, and which may in
  fact be deliberate attempts to bully, include:
  ▪ name calling, ‘pet’ names, deliberate and persistent mispronunciations
  ▪ humiliating use of language usually publicly
  ▪ sarcasm, insulting or demeaning language used to address students
  ▪ gestures, expressions, activities which may be intimidating or
    degrading
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Understanding Bullying - Types

Teachers take to plastic surgery to cut cruel jibes

Newman

Taunted teachers turn to surgery

Teachers may be seriously effected by the bullying behaviours of students and others.

Read and discuss
Present data simply. This provides some background about what to expect from the school data, and some notes for comparison.

It lists outcomes for primary and secondary aged students, and indicates boys are much more likely to be bullied or to report having been bullied.

You may have other data you wish to present or discuss at this point.
WHERE DOES BULLYING TAKE PLACE?
Children were asked "Where does bullying usually take place?" Some wanted to give more than one response but were told to choose the place they thought it was most common.

Table 5: Where does bullying usually take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Boys (1486)</th>
<th>Girls (1031)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor/Pastry</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Area</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rigby & Sylte, 1992. All students were asked where they thought bullying happened.

Most identified the playground as an area of concern, but not the classroom.
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This indicates that when students who are not bullied are asked about where it happens they select the playground as the key location—often because they observe it there.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
Understanding Bullying—Where?

The most common location for bullying reported by the sample as a whole was the playground (48%). However, since half of these pupils have never been bullied, their views of recent victims were examined. 44% of them said that bullying usually took place in the playground while 28% cited the classroom. 4% of the sample had been bullied on their way to or from school since Christmas. This was most likely to happen to younger children and those who travelled by school bus.

Rigby & Stoll 1995 bullied students were asked where they thought bullying happened.

The classroom was identified as an location of concern.
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However when bullied students are asked where it happens the classroom features surprisingly regularly. This is often a surprise to teachers.
Healey study 1999-2002 4 metropolitan Sydney high schools comprising two co-ed and two girls' schools who requested assistance to survey and intervene in bullying.

Indicates that although the sample was skewed towards female participants, males were disproportionately represented in the bullied group.

Bullied students nominated safe and unsafe places; toilets and bus travel were generally viewed as the least safe places, followed by corridors and the quad. The library is seen as the safest place even though we now know that 10 of the 13 victims of the Columbine massacre were shot while sequestered in the library.
# BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

Understanding Bullying-Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attended</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain cook high</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many immaculate college</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalen england</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st. barnabas college</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students (N = 3247) were asked how serious they thought the problem was at their school.

26.6% saw it as a moderate to serious problem.

J. B. Healey 2004

Bullying in Your School: Manual
Jean B. Healey

Students were asked how serious the problem was in their school.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
understanding Bullying-issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain ooe high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within mild</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary ann college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within mild</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magastra anglic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within mild</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st benabas college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within mild</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school attended</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within serious</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within mild</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bullied students were asked how serious the problem of bullying was at their school.

30-49% saw it as a moderate to serious problem.

J.R. Healey 2004

Bullied students were asked how serious the problem was in their school and saw it as more of a problem.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
Understanding Bullying-Issues

All students were asked if they would report bullying to a teacher.
27-39% said 'no' 60-89% said yes

Reporting to a teacher is still seen as 'dodging' event hough it is reporting abusive and damaging behaviour. Most students would report but many students also expressed their doubts about the capacity and willingness of teachers to intervene.
## BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL

### Understanding Bullying-Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% within school attended</th>
<th>% within what you report to a teacher?</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bullied students were asked if they would report to a teacher.

33-46% said yes; 45-60% said no.

J.R. Healey 2004

Bullied in Your School Manual

Jean S. Healey

Fewer bullied students were willing to report it often for fear of reprisals, but the majority would still seek teacher intervention.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL
Understanding Bullying-Issues

- Would you help someone you saw being bullied?
  All students: 74.8%
  Bullied students: 66.9%

- Does school help you feel good?
  All students: 43.4% said most feel good
  Bullied students: 36.4% said most feel good

- The majority of students irrespective of bullied status would help someone they saw being bullied. This is a good indicator that a supportive intervention like Peer Advocacy could be implemented with success.

- While most students felt the school had a good impact on student self-concept, less than 50% of bullied students felt that the school was supportive. This seems to indicate a need for supportive intervention.

Read and discuss other issues.
This section of the presentation outlines the overall plan for the process of intervention to remind the group of the next steps.

You need to explain that following the presentation the school data will be presented and discussed generally. It will be available for further scrutiny during the workshops.
BULLYING IN YOUR SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS

DATA COLLECTION

- Survey distributed and collected before in-service for staff
- Survey results analysed during in-service for staff
- Survey results analysed and applied during workshops
- Survey results used to determine processes, procedures and resources

IN-SERVICE DAY

- View CD presentation for background information on bullying generally
- Attend and contribute to workshops to determine policy, resources, reporting, supervision based on school data

Read and remind participants
# Bullying in Your School: Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Restructuring</th>
<th>Anti-bullying Curriculum for All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Following IN-SERVICE HOLD CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOPS</td>
<td>- Select Peer Advocacy© Program for Senior Students (Healey, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Put in place the structures determined in workshops including Supervision, Policy, Resources, Supports</td>
<td>- Select Other Suitable Curriculum for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allocate responsibilities for implementation</td>
<td>- Individual Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Determine and apply interventions for victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Determine and apply interventions for bullies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read and remind participants.
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PROPOSED CLIENTELE: ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL
(EXECUTIVE)
YOUTH WORKERS

The following comprises two modules, each at two levels, for implementation in the preparation of staff involved in the development of the Robinson Behaviour Management Unit:

MODULE 1: UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

LEVEL 1: Principles and dynamics of challenging behaviour

LEVEL 2: Level 1 content and fostering and maintaining staff competencies in understanding challenging behaviours.

MODULE 2: DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

LEVEL 1: Foundation strategies and methods for developing a behaviour management plan

LEVEL 2: Level 1 content and Systems level behaviour management Developing and monitoring staff competencies in behaviour management

Included in each module are:

Teaching guidelines
Overheads
Worksheets
Supplementary activities
Sample documentation

The modules have been composed and presented by:

Jean B. Jenkin
Lecturer, Special Education
University of Western Sydney (Macarthur)
PO Box 555
CAMPBELLTOWN 2560
Phone 772 9436
ROBINSON UNIT TRAINING PROGRAM

JEAN B. JENKIN

UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

RATIONALE:

An understanding of the basic elements of the behaviour that can be expected of young people in a specialist, high security detention facility, is fundamental to a successful program of intervention. Personnel involved with such young people are expected to establish and maintain successful therapeutic, and socially supportive relationships as well as to provide a safe and secure environment. They must take account of the psychological, moral, emotional and cognitive developmental needs of the detainee, and demonstrate cultural empathy and awareness. Further, personnel must develop competencies in identifying, analysing and addressing a range of challenging behaviours through the application of systematic procedures including data collection, program design and implementation. At the executive level, leadership in establishing and maintaining staff commitment, skills and morale is essential. This program attempts to address these matters.
ROBINSON UNIT PROGRAM

OUTCOMES:

LEVEL 1: PARTICIPANTS WILL:

- express attitudes and beliefs which indicate an acceptable remedial, rehabilitative and supportive approach to managing clients with challenging behaviours

- develop and demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental elements of challenging behaviours

- demonstrate effective implementation of all elements of the behaviour management plan developed at the system level and for individual clients

- effectively document client responses to the behaviour management plan.

LEVEL 2: PARTICIPANTS, IN ADDITION TO ACHIEVING LEVEL 1 OUTCOMES WILL:

- demonstrate a capacity to effectively communicate with staff engaged in the behaviour management program

- maintain an overview of the program goals while remaining cognisant of individual needs and progress

- acquire competencies in the design and implementation of a systems-wide (unit) behaviour management program

- monitor documentation to support accountability in the behaviour management program

- consistently review and improve the behaviour management plan based on feedback and observations from program participants (staff and clients)
Correctional Juvenile Education - An Overview of Service Delivery and Population Characteristics

Factors contributing to the incarceration of young offenders are a combination of personal characteristics and societal procedures. Some analysis of these needs to be undertaken before a discussion of service provision and individual needs can be attempted. These children and youths who become the recipients of correctional education present with specific behavioural, achievement and personality traits, and it is the interaction of these with the justice system that impacts upon correctional education. It is suggested here that pre-existing personal conditions and experiences may interfere with the success of correctional education programmes, and that some review of content in these programmes may need to be undertaken in order to guarantee greater success and relevance in the future.

As early as 1907, Homer T. Lane (in Clatworthy 1982) established a 'democratic' self governing institution for 'problem boys'. The 'Boys Republic' operated on the philosophy that personality characteristics evident in the boys were related to their interactions within society. He attempted to establish an environment which took account of interpersonal needs as a primary focus, and his philosophy may well be relevant for today's correctional services.

1. Characteristics of the Population in Juvenile Correctional Education Programmes

A simplistic summary of the characteristics of incarcerated learners could include the statements that members of the group are generally below the mean in reading, have mathematical handicaps that interfere with their productivity, independence and self esteem (Alexander and Caldwell 1983) and have difficulty with interpersonal relationships. Clatworthy (1982) quotes Homer T. Lane in 1908 suggesting that the need to "experiment with independence and self reliance" is the main reason why youths get into trouble, and that it is the heavy-handed response of the justice system to this expected rebelliousness, which exacerbates incidents unnecessarily. In addition, unremediated learning difficulties, language and cultural differences, and undiagnosed impaired intellectual functioning are contributing factors to youth offences. (Traynelis-Yureh & Gracobbe, 1988). Severe behaviour disorders, in particular sexual behaviour disorders are also manifested (Gable 1982, Erikson 1982). Further review of these characteristics may clarify the composition of the population and offer direction for the establishment of appropriate programmes.

1.1 Behaviour and Personality Characteristics in Juvenile Offenders

Specific traits identified in incarcerated youths, and which generally contributed to their placement in correctional institutions, include aggressive acting out and extreme attention seeking behaviour; immature or withdrawn behaviour, self injury, school avoidance or truancy and illegal activities. Smith (in Braaton 1983) describes psychopathic behaviour and discusses some concerns for treatment due to the lack of alignment between the values of the youths in therapy, and those of the therapist. If values are related to socio-economic status and are situational specific, some review of treatment seems warranted, since those values being expounded by therapists may be meaningless to the youths in therapy. (Gable 1982). Sexual behaviour indicative of a general antisocial orientation in youths includes child molestation, exhibitionism and assault, often involving rape (Erikson
1982). Promiscuity is not generally identified as a deviant behaviour in male adolescent offenders although it may be in female offenders. Prostitution for both males and females is identified as a contributing factor to juvenile crime, and the participants are almost always identified as having been victims, initially, often in the home. The early literature on child sexual abuse suggested various reasons for the inappropriate sexual activity, and overall took an unsympathetic view of the participants. Certainly the responsibility for recruitment to prostitution was not laid at the feet of the offending father (Fallen 1987) until recently. In addition, the early literature included offenders incarcerated for consenting homosexual acts and these are no longer included in the statistics or discussion on sexual offences by juveniles. The more recent view emphasises the close relationship between aggression and sexual offences and clearly indicates that the sexual avenue is selected to express violent antisocial emotions not urgent sexual needs.

1.2 Achievement and Intellectual Characteristics of Juvenile Offenders

The landmark American legislation (PL94-142-Education for all Handicapped Children Act) is least well implemented in correctional institutions. Statistics indicate that overall up to 40% of incarcerated people in the United States have some kind of handicapping condition (Coffey 1983), with a much larger percentage for incarcerated children and youths. Most of these are not receiving appropriate remedial or vocational education. Further, youths having mildly impaired intellectual functioning are over-represented in detention facilities, there being three times as many in the detained population as in the overall population. This does not indicate that these youths are more prone to criminal activity but that they are less likely to have formulated a successful plan for the activity and that they are more likely to be detained than to be cautioned, partly because of their impaired social functioning and their inability to articulate a defence. Coffey (1983) refers to a study by Tantamour and West which demonstrates that mildly intellectually impaired offenders also serve longer sentences because of their inability to meet parole requirements. They fail to achieve in correctional education programmes and accumulate numerous disciplinary infractions because of their failure to correctly interpret rules within the facility. Because of frequent absences from school, often a handicapping condition is not identified prior to incarceration. Frequent transfer and high mobility of the population within detention facilities are also factors contributing to the difficulty in establishing appropriate individual programmes.

Academic and literacy levels are generally low.

An interesting programme was initiated by the Governor of Virginia in 1987 - the “no read, no release” policy. In acknowledgement of the high cost of illiteracy and the “revolving door of crime” evident in his state, he determined that all prisoners should be functionally literate to grade level before being released. Only those certified as specifically intellectually impaired were exempt.

The identification of incarcerated young offenders as learning disabled, mildly intellectually impaired or behaviour disordered must be the initial step in the development of suitable educational programmes for facilities in Australia also. Assessment of
achievement or performance levels, coupled with implementation of individual education programmes at an appropriate level should be no more difficult in correctional locations than in other special education settings especially since the link between learning difficulties and juvenile offences is well established (Ball 1987)

2. **Personnel in Correctional Education Programmes**

The interaction between teaching, therapeutic, counselling, security, welfare personnel in correctional education settings is a major factor in the establishment and continuation of successful programmes. A number of issues are raised in this regard and these include those related to financial support for programmes (provision of staff and resources), facilitation of educational opportunities along the continuum of services available generally, from primary to post-secondary programmes; training and recruitment of appropriate teaching and counselling staff; interpersonal and professional relationships between security and teaching personnel and the status of educational programmes within the facility (Wolford 1983).

In order for the field of correctional education to be legitimized in Australian facilities a policy relating to the functional goals of programmes needs to be developed. This would form the basis for a specific training module to be produced, and undergraduate or postgraduate certification could be provided. The current procedure in N.S.W. is for general training in primary or secondary education, sometimes supplemented by special education courses, to be the only prerequisite for employment in correctional programmes.

Less than 1% of teachers in correctional settings in the United States have special education training (Wolford 1983). In addition, specific knowledge about the functions of correctional institution, personality characteristics of offenders and a clear understanding of the effectiveness of rewards and punishment need to be incorporated into any correctional teacher training programme. It is also suggested that some analysis of pre-service teacher personality traits be undertaken, similar to those given, for example, to police cadets prior to training and service (Topp & Kardash 1983) in order to screen for "self concept, independence and persistence" - these personality traits being seen as predictive of success in interpersonal areas.

Apart from teaching personnel, the presence of a counsellor supplements services for educational programmes in correctional facilities. The 'school counsellor' role and function is to assess performance and ability levels, and to offer a counselling service for youths in need of emotional/psychological support. Assessment is a priority function (Hesticks 1987), and can contribute to educational programme planning and placement in appropriate classes. Supplementary services offered by counsellors however, could include self-esteem and social skills programmes, anger control and group therapy sessions. The factor which impacts most upon this is time, as most psychologist and counsellor appointments to correctional and support services are fractional, leaving counsellors very little time to engage in interactive programmes.

An innovation in personnel involvement has been reported (Loughhead, Levy and Hewitt 1982) and this involves the establishment of a Youth Advocacy Teacher Corps. In response to an acknowledged need for supportive spokespersons, the corps was established in 1972. Programmes for 'troubled youth' were established in co-operation with district high schools, with the goal being diversion of potential offenders and support for them during initial contacts with justice agencies. In addition a re-entry initiative as an
alternative to correctional education was established.

3. Composition of Programmes

The literature identifies a number of areas of need in establishing education programmes in correctional facilities. These include remediation and basic literacy skills, pre-vocational skills and surprisingly play and games skills. It has been demonstrated (Traynelish, Turch & Gracobbe 1988) that unremediated learning difficulties can be related to recidivism and reincarceration for young offenders. The importance of motivation and the impact of the learning environment have been considered (Williams 1984) and specific recommendations for motivational techniques, and instructional management described.

The impact of Peer Culture (Laufenberg 1987) and the possibility of incorporating co-operative learning strategies (Johnson & Johnson) is also discussed. Some researchers suggest that academic achievement within correctional facilities is not related to rehabilitation (Martinson in Holloway 1986) and it is suggested that the lack of relevance of programmes to the functioning of the offender in mainstream society has a major impact on recidivism. A vocational skills emphasis will prepare the juvenile for employment and support him during parole.

Little innovation in the delivery of correctional education programmes is evident. Delivery models which supplement vocational and literacy skill development with self-esteem and personal skill development are likely to produce better results.

Some consideration of the nature of the crime should be undertaken so that students incarcerated for more serious offences and long term imprisonment can be catered for specifically, and transient or extremely young offenders can be separated from them. The issue of gifted or talented youths needs to be addressed and programmes which encourage the development of their skills and the implementation of them to secure employment needs to be devised. There can be no doubt that the leadership ability necessary to conduct a heroin ring in a school could be much more appropriately channelled by interested and capable teachers in the correctional setting.

Finally, the importance of play and games in programmes for incarcerated youth is a welcome new emphasis. Since these students are often depressed, withdrawn and unhappy or aggressive and dominant in their interpersonal relationships (Mindes and Murphy 1983) the opportunity to participate in structured games where rules are seen as fair and non-negotiable, can be an ideal situation for fostering the development of appropriate interpersonal skills. These researchers emphasize the developmental nature of play and suggest that opportunities to progress in play skills be devised to encourage development along the normal developmental continuum. "Structured regression" has been a term applied to this strategy and it has been most successful with emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children outside correctional facilities. (Brother 1988)
MODULE 1

UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

LEVEL 1: PRINCIPLES AND DYNAMICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOURS
For youth workers, teachers, counsellors engaged with youth in high security detention

LEVEL 2: FOSTERING AND MAINTAINING STAFF COMPETENCIES
For senior executive and management overseeing staff engaged with youth in high security detention
MODULE 1 - UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR
LEVEL 1 - PRINCIPLES AND DYNAMICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: As a result of this module it is expected that participants will be able to:

1.1 demonstrate an understanding of basic principles such as the purpose and maintenance of challenging behaviours

1.2 analyse behaviour in terms of motivating factors, reinforcement and consequences

1.3 demonstrate an awareness of appropriate interpersonal skills for managing difficult behaviours

1.4 recognize situations in which there is the potential for violence of conflict and identify appropriate response strategies

1.5 express attitudes and beliefs which reflect a commitment to a remedial, rehabilitative and restorative approach to managing difficult behaviour

1.6 explain cultural variations in the development and expression of challenging behaviour.
### Learning Unit: UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

**MODULE 1/LEVEL 1 PRINCIPLES AND DYNAMICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING TOPIC</th>
<th>SESSION NO:</th>
<th>ACTIVITY DURATION</th>
<th>REQUIRED RESOURCE</th>
<th>CONTENT/PROCEDURE/KEY POINTS</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPES OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>PART A</td>
<td>9.00-9.30</td>
<td>Worksheet provided x2</td>
<td>Dynamics &amp; types of challenging behaviour; analysis or scenarios based on own experience</td>
<td>3.2.2/3.4.2/3.4.1 Understands the origins of challenging behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTER-OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>PART B</td>
<td>9.30-10.00</td>
<td>Worksheet provided x1 Information sheets provided x3</td>
<td>Conflict cycle: analysis of tantrum behaviour; psychoeducational stages developmental levels</td>
<td>3.2/3.2.7/3.3.5/3.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING YOUR OWN BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>PART C</td>
<td>10.00-10.30</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x5</td>
<td>Personality analysis; relating to others and interface of staff and client behaviour</td>
<td>3.1.1/3.1.7/3.1.9/3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>PART D</td>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Discussion of indicators; origins; premises</td>
<td>3.2.1/3.2.6/3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABORIGINALITY AND INCARCERATION</td>
<td>PART E</td>
<td>1.30-2.15</td>
<td>Video: 'BBQ Area'</td>
<td>Indigenous issues and cross-cultural considerations</td>
<td>3.1.1/2.3.1/2.3.4/3.2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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MODULE 1 - UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

LEVEL 1 PRINCIPLES AND DYNAMICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

PART A

TYPES OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR
Individual Scenarios
Dynamics of Challenging Behaviour
Analysis of Scenarios
Discussion-relationship of types to scenarios

PART B

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR
Conflict cycle
Temper Tantrum model
Psychoeducational Stages
Developmental Levels

PART C

UNDERSTANDING YOUR OWN BEHAVIOUR
Personality Analysis
Relating to others scale
The Interface of Staff and Client Behaviour

PART D

VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR
Indicators
Origins - Internal/External
Premises
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

In addition to the objectives determined in level 1 it is expected that participants at level 2 will be able to:

2.1 demonstrate effective communication skills in coaching team members in the acquisition of appropriate competencies

2.2 demonstrate positive and supportive interpersonal interactions with team members and clients

2.3 analyse personnel needs for training and support in the acquisition of appropriate interpersonal and professional skills

2.4 establish effective systems of team collaboration and communication to facilitate positive management of difficult behaviours

2.5 demonstrate effective methods of monitoring documentation for behaviour management purposes.
## Learning Unit: UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

### MODULE 1/LEVEL 2 - (LEVEL 1 CONTENT AND: FOSTERING AND MAINTAINING STAFF COMPETENCIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING TOPIC</th>
<th>SESSION NO:</th>
<th>ACTIVITY DURATION</th>
<th>REQUIRED RESOURCE</th>
<th>CONTENT/PROCEDURE/KEY POINTS</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTS A B &amp; D</td>
<td>9.00-10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM Module 1/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABELLED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART A,B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFACE OF</td>
<td>PART C</td>
<td>10.00-10.30</td>
<td>Worksheets</td>
<td>Personality analysis;</td>
<td>3.5.6/3.5.8/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided x 4</td>
<td>management style analysis;</td>
<td>3.3.1/3.3.23.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIENT BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion relating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management style to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>PART D</td>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Staff competencies</td>
<td>Analysis of proposed staff</td>
<td>6.1.4/6.1.6/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>checklist</td>
<td>competencies checklist;</td>
<td>6.1.7/6.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worksheets</td>
<td>discussion of inclusions/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provided x 2</td>
<td>exclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART E</td>
<td>FROM Module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODULE 1 - UNDERSTANDING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR

LEVEL 2 INCLUDES FOSTERING AND MAINTAINING STAFF COMPETENCIES

PART A TYPES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOURS
- Individual Scenarios
- Dynamics and Types
- Conflict Cycle
- Temper Tantrum Model
- Psychoeducational Stages

PART B VIOLENT BEHAVIOURS
- Indicators
- Origins - Internal/external
- Premises

PART C INTERFACE OF STAFF AND CLIENT BEHAVIOUR
- Personality Analysis
- Management Style
- Relate to Management Issues and Scenarios

PART D STAFF COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST
- Analysis and Proposals for Inclusion
- Application Issues
PROPOSED PERSONAL COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST FOR STAFF INVOLVED IN THE MANAGEMENT OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOURS

The following checklist (After Barajas 1982) attempts to identify appropriate personal characteristics which staff need to develop and demonstrate to ensure effective professional management of young people with challenging behaviours in the detention environment. It is not meant to function as a punitive supervisory tool, with consequences for failure to meet the designated standard. It is meant to assist personnel in targeting areas of personal development which may represent strengths or weaknesses in their interpersonal interactions. Self monitoring and assessment is encouraged. Discussion of outcomes with management should be seen as an opportunity to receive positive feedback as well as advice and support in improving skills. Nevertheless, the instrument could also be useful in directing the attention of less-competent staff to areas which need to be addressed in order to improve their effectiveness. The checklist should be used as a fully collaborative document aimed at ensuring the highest level of staff morale and competency in the difficult environment of the detention unit. Certification of accomplishment may be considered with periodic re-certification to maintain high standards.

Following the checklist of suggested competencies which is by no means exhaustive, is a glossary of possible definitions for the levels and competencies
If such a structured review of competencies is seen as warranted, it is likely that they will be varied and added to as the program progresses.

An appropriate mechanism for utilizing the checklist needs to be devised. Self identification and monitoring is a very valuable method as is client feedback (Marsh 1991). This combined with management input could result in an optimum level being maintained. Application, nevertheless, will be a crucial factor - it is suggested that a systematic, positive and predictable approach be taken without punitive consequences unless the staff member is clearly unsuitable and remains at the unacceptable levels despite support and assistance.
PERSONAL COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST:

It is anticipated that should a personal competencies checklist be used to support staff in the development of appropriate, effective skills for the management of challenging clients, that a support strategy be implemented to ensure achievement at the optimum level. This must include policies, managerial practices such as coaching communication and support and a specific plan for improvement and recognition.

CATEGORY 1

1. PERSONAL MORALE:

It is anticipated that staff engaging in successful interpersonal interactions with clients and others will be capable of a sophisticated level of introspection and will demonstrate a high level of ability in terms of communicating with clients in a firm respectful and professional manner consistent with the clients individual needs and capabilities. Such skills will be demonstrated through the following competencies:

1.1 Mood:

Mood can be defined as the overall demeanor of the person, and usually reflects affective (emotional) status. While people are not always expected to be in a 'happy' mood, what is expected is that the pervading mood does not interfere with effective, consistent management. The
preferred level to be demonstrated is a consistent, positive mood with predictability in interactions with clients. A staff member will be less effective if ‘mood swings’ or ‘moodiness’ is evident. The minimum level acceptable would be a reportedly ‘usually’ positive mood. It is an unacceptable level of performance for personnel to demonstrate inconsistencies and negativity which impacts upon their effectiveness.

1.2 **Attitude:**

Refers the expressed views, beliefs and opinions of personnel. It would probably be appropriate for staff to express positive and acceptable attitudes towards such issues as management practices, individual client progress, and personal considerations such as race, religion, sexual preference, etc. The preferred level for effective management would be reflected in expressed attitudes which are supportive, unbiased, uncritical, non judgemental and culturally sensitive. Obviously, it is only relevant to consider attitudes towards factors which will have an impact on the successful management of clients. The minimum level acceptable for expressed attitude would be that the staff member is usually positive, supportive etc., with the unacceptable level being expressed attitudes which are derogatory, particularly of clients as individuals, or in relation to their cultural, religious, social or other key orientations.
The *minimum level* acceptable would permit only minor breaches, an occasional use of inappropriate language or increased vocal tone in dealing with incidents. It is *unacceptable* for staff to lose personal control and engage in physical and/or verbal abuse in retaliation for misdemeanors or as a means of managing such behaviour.

1.5 **Empathy:**

refers to the care and concern expressed and demonstrated by staff towards clients. This characteristic is particularly important in this setting since it is likely that such behaviour has been lacking in the life of the young client, and it is also likely that he has great difficulty understanding and expressing such a basic human trait. Empathy training for these clients can begin by encouraging staff to clearly demonstrate empathy for the socio-emotional, physical, educational recreational and personal needs of the client. This does not mean that sympathy and pity should characterise interactions or be the determinants of decisions. It does mean that everyday expressions of concern for the clients' well being, health success and aspirations are appropriate and will lead to the development of trust.

The preferred **minimum level** is most likely to be demonstrated by a staff member who is considered humane, flexible and fair as well as consistent and having high expectations for client compliance.

The *minimum level* would be reflected by a staff member who is generally considered humane, caring, flexible and fair, with the occasional breach which would see the member labelled 'tough' or 'mean'.
1.3 **Motivation:**

Refers to the desire and effort to support and succeed in the unit management plan evident, in the staff-members' interactions, with clients. Positive use of verbal interactions and careful use of language indicating strong support for the unit management and procedures would constitute the preferred level. The minimum level acceptable would comprise effective and professional communications, during incidents or at other times, which indicate support for the client and unit management. It would be considered an unacceptable level of performance should the staff member indicate a lack of motivation to assist or support client or unit management.

1.4 **Self control:**

An essential skill in the personal repertoire of the staff member, is the ability to refrain from self-indulgence in the emotional aspects of the work of dealing with challenging behaviours. It is not expected that staff members become emotion-less, but it is expected that they demonstrate a capacity to use cognition rather than affect in dealing with incidents. The preferred level is demonstrated when staff, despite perhaps deliberate provocation, personal abuse and rejection by clients are nevertheless able to deal with incidents in a calm and consistent manner. The unit plan, if appropriately structured, will provide an agreed consequence for unacceptable verbal and/or physical abuse of staff and the exemplary staff member will use this knowledge and authority to manage the misdemeanors.
Alternatively the staff member who is seen to allow deviations from set standards of behaviour because they 'feel sorry for' clients, will be ineffective and labelled 'soft' or 'easy'. Neither condition is optimal for effective management. The fine line must be maintained. It would be unacceptable therefore for a staff member to be clearly unfair, inflexible, lacking in care or consideration of client needs and evidently oblivious to client feelings; it is also unacceptable for the staff member to lose professional distance, demonstrate physical or verbal affection to an excessive degree, deviate from established procedures and guidelines in order to show empathy for the client.

2. INTERACTION SKILLS

The foundation of successful management is the development of exemplary interpersonal interaction skills. While these are difficult to analyse and quantify, it is very important to establish, as a unit management goal, that the development and exhibition of such basic skills is greatly valued, if not a requirement. At very least the following skills should be evident and assessed:

2.1 Communication:

The verbal and non-verbal communication which staff use in their interactions with clients are fundamental to successful management.
The staff member who is viewed as performing at the preferred level will use appropriate language, vocal tone, eye contact, mannerisms, facial expressions and gestures to deliver positive and supportive messages to clients even during incidents when clients may be exhibiting a lack of self control. At the minimum level staff should generally be able to communicate effectively, demonstrate a in change pattern and style if it is evident that their communication is not achieving the desired result and show a willingness to learn and practice new techniques of communication. It is unacceptable for staff to communicate in an abusive, rejecting, judgemental, derogatory, insulting or tormenting fashion with clients either verbally or through non-verbal means.

2.2 Listening

Effective interaction with clients will include active and responsive listening in both the day to day context and at times of crisis. The preferred level of appropriate listening will be demonstrated by the staff member who remains alert and responsive to client verbal interactions, particularly complaints and attempts to explain incidents. The staff member at this level will respond in a non-judgemental manner, having listened carefully and will be able to report to the client what it is they have heard. The effective listener should also be able to question the client for clarification based on the information received and report to a colleague or other relevant worker, an accurate account of the dialogue.
At the minimum level the staff member will be positive, responsive and accurate. Most of the time during interactions with clients. An unacceptable level of listening competency occurs when the staff member is directing, reprimanding or otherwise interrupting the clients; attempts to give an account or respond to a directive. The staff member will be unable to explain the incident as expressed by the client.

2.3 Appropriate Demonstration of Disapproval

The well-trained staff member will cognisant of the impact of their disapproval on the behaviour of clients. This means that overt disapproval may reinforce some clients and escalate their behaviour, while for others it may result in compliance. The staff member operating at the preferred level will indicate disapproval by direct reference to rules, codes of conduct and procedures which have been breached. They will discuss the breach without the need for personal abuse, humiliation or punishment but calmly and professionally inform the client of the procedure that will follow the breach or the notified consequence attached to the breach. Staff who operate at the minimum level will usually use an appropriate tone of voice with occasional use of a raised voice. They will indicate a clear intention to retain self-control and use appropriate procedures. Staff who are operating at the unacceptable level will express disapproval in inappropriate use of vocal tone, language content and manner.
2.4 Management Style

While it may be anticipated that staff will demonstrate a range of approaches to management of clients and incidents, it is expected that each will, at the preferred level, engage in management practices which are positive, supportive, consistent and directive and which lead to positive outcomes. At the minimum level, staff must demonstrate reasonable competence at managing challenging behaviour, as evidenced by evaluations from clients and colleagues. At the unacceptable level the management style of the staff member will be controlling, negative, rejecting and power-seeking elements or characteristics.

2.5 Physical Interactions

Physical interactions between client and staff member must demonstrate awareness of child protection legislation as well as social and cultural mores and norms. It must not involve intimate behaviour or behaviour which could be described as overly affectionate or sexual. Nor can it involve behaviours which are physically punitive, harsh or harmful to clients. At the preferred level, staff members would be expected to engage in physical interactions which demonstrate a socially acceptable level of friendliness, for example shaking hands, care and warmth, such as a pat on the back. There should be no question in the mind of an observer or recipient of the physical interaction as to the intention of the act. It is important to bear in mind that a therapeutic and remedial milieu will occasion some physical interaction and that this may be necessary for the well-being of the client.
At the minimum level staff should be able to demonstrate warmth, care and friendliness as appropriate if not on a regular or consistent basis. It is unacceptable to engage physically with clients in a punitive or harmful manner.

3 PERSONAL PRESENTATION

3.1 Physical Comportment

The physical comportment of the staff member is only relevant when discussed in relation to operational effect. This refers to the general physical demeanour during on-duty periods. It would include a capacity to identify and respond to client behavioural indicators of an impending incident. It would include at the preferred level the use of physical proximity to diffuse and manage challenging behaviour. This staff member would be consistently in close proximity to clients, usually standing and mobile as opposed to seated and observing although this may have a place in management. The staff member will be frequently interacting, at a professionally appropriate physical distance and be demonstrating reasonable physical agility and presence. At the minimum level it may be acceptable for staff to remain seated or in one place if they are closely supervising or interacting with clients for recreational or program delivery purposes. It is an unacceptable level of performance for staff to be constantly seated, discrated by conversations and activities other than those of clients or to be engaging in irrelevant and inappropriate activities such as private reading etc.
It is also unacceptable for staff to use their physical posture to intimidate clients for example by adopting an exaggerated physical stature, threatening posture or by holding anything which could be construed as a weapon.

3.2 Functional dress

Staff may be required to wear uniform in which case it is anticipated that the functionality of the basic wardrobe will have been considered in the design. However, whether or not the clothing is prescribed, certain features of staff members' garb and adornments may contribute to unsafe, insecure or dangerous situations arising. At the preferred level of functional dress staff will wear clothing and footwear which are appropriate to the work and setting. To this end several items of dress and adornment can be seen as inappropriate including loose belts which are tied or clipped around the waist; neckties and necklaces should not be worn; jewellery should be kept to a minimum with watches having expandable wristbands and being inexpensive and replaceable; pierced earrings which are loops through the ears should be avoided, as should brooches, pins and badges of any description which incorporate a pin attachment; footwear should have a functionally low level heel or be athletic in design; smooth and conservative lines of dress and clothing will be more appropriate than unduly elaborate daywear. At a minimum level staff will comply with an established dress code and substantial breaches particularly if they contribute to incidents would indicate an unacceptable level.
3.3 Fitness for Duty

Staff should be reasonably fit, mentally and physically healthy and of average physical competence to function effectively. Generally, staff who are ill, physically incapacitated (e.g. broken arm etc) or who have a physical disability which could jeopardise their own safety should not be present in the unit. This could include infectious diseases which could be transmitted to other staff and clients (flu, chicken pox etc) as well as a general level in poor health which would make the a staff member unfit for the particular duties. At the preferred level, staff will have a high level of health, reasonable fitness and competence; at a minimum level staff should function effectively across the physical domain and it would be unacceptable for staff to continue in their duties when they are clearly unwell or unfit.

3.4 Alertness

This describes a condition of vigilance which is necessary for staff to supervise clients. A lack of concentration, failure to notice indicators of potential challenging behaviour and lack of attentiveness due to personal conditions are factors which may lead to a lack of alertness. At the preferred level, staff will remain in eye contact with and closely monitor clients to ensure their safety, well-being and progress; at the minimum level this would be the case for the majority of the time and it would be unacceptable for staff to be negligent in their level of alertness to possible problems and challenges within the unit.
# PERSONAL COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

## 1. LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL MORALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Mood</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Review Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1.2 Attitude** |
| **1.3 Motivation** |
| **1.4 Self Control** |
| **1.5 Empathy** |

## 2. INTERACTION SKILLS

<p>| <strong>2.1 Communication</strong> |
| <strong>2.2 Listening Interpretation</strong> |
| <strong>2.3 Appropriate demonstration of disapproval</strong> |
| <strong>2.4 Management style</strong> |
| <strong>2.5 Physical interactions</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>PREFERRED LEVEL</th>
<th>MINIMUM LEVEL</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. PERSONAL PRESENTATION</td>
<td>CONSISTENTLY HIGH PROFESSIONAL OPTIMUM</td>
<td>USUALLY GOOD STANDARD</td>
<td>POOR STANDARD LOW FUNCTIONING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Physical comportment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Functional dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Fitness for duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Alertness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 REFERENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIENT'S GOAL: POWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACKING BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>HOW STAFF FEELS AND REACTS</th>
<th>DEFENDING BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEELS AND REACTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>Feels threatened</td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argues</td>
<td>Feels angry</td>
<td>Unco-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Feels authority is</td>
<td>Forgetful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant</td>
<td>being challenged</td>
<td>Disobedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradicts</td>
<td>Wants to get on top</td>
<td>(refuses to do what he is told)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobedient (carried out forbidden acts)</td>
<td>'If you think I'm going to stand for this, you're mistaken'</td>
<td>Frequent sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temper tantrums</td>
<td>'I'll teach you to defy me'</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully 'Boss'</td>
<td>You won't get away with this</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels victorious when behaviour is quelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Types of Behaviour Classified as Power and Staff Feelings and Reactions to Them.
## CLIENT'S GOAL: REVENGE

*(FROM BALSON 1984)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</th>
<th>HOW STAFF FEELS AND REACTS</th>
<th>DEFENDING BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vicious</td>
<td>Feels badly upset</td>
<td>Sullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tough guy'</td>
<td>Feels deeply hurt</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty</td>
<td>Feels measure of trepidation</td>
<td>Morose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutal</td>
<td>'What will he do next?'</td>
<td>Refuses to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>'What have I done to deserve this?'</td>
<td>Feeling of injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td>'How could he do this to me?'</td>
<td>Feels that child is ungrateful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>'What an ungrateful person!'</td>
<td>'Well, two can play this game'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Must be punished'</td>
<td>'This won't get you anywhere'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of immense relief and hope at any sign of improvement</td>
<td>'It's not my job to placate or appease you'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'You can make the first move'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of self-justification if child displays acceptable behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Types of Behaviour Classified as Revenge and Staff Feelings and Reactions to Them
CLIENT'S GOAL: ATTENTION SEEKING

(From Balson 1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACKING BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>HOW STAFF FEELS AND REACTS</th>
<th>DEFENDING BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</td>
<td>HOW STAFF FEELS AND REACTS</td>
<td>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a nuisance</td>
<td>Annoyed and irritated</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The show-off</td>
<td>'For goodness sake, stop it'</td>
<td>Wants help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The clown</td>
<td>Feeling of relief</td>
<td>Bashful, shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The smart Alec</td>
<td>when the annoying behaviour ceases</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The walking question mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Untidiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing, obtrusive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-indulgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassing behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech impediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil tapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The talker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frivolous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'I must do something'
Sense of responsibility
Urge or coax into action
Feeling of encouragement when student responds

Figure 2: Types of Behaviour Classified as Attention Seeking and Staff Feelings and Reactions to them.
CLIENT'S GOAL: PASSIVE - AGGRESSIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT'S STRATEGY</th>
<th>HOW STAFF FEEL AND REACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stupidity</td>
<td>Feeling Of Inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idleness</td>
<td>Feeling of helplessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indolence</td>
<td>Feeling of despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapable</td>
<td>'I just don't know what more I can do'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority</td>
<td>'I am at my wit's end'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won't mix</td>
<td>'I give up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary activities</td>
<td>'What can I do with her?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy activities</td>
<td>Instances of improved behaviour are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babyish ways</td>
<td>seized upon hopefully. (Perhaps he's a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Hopelessness'</td>
<td>a late developer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td>Expect nothing of student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5  Types of Behaviour Classified as Escape by Withdrawal and Staff's Feelings and Reactions to Them
## OHP

**TEMPER TANTRUM MODEL (ADAPTED FROM TREISCHMAN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1: RUMBLING &amp; GRUMBLING</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- DISCONTENT EVIDENT-DRIBBLING</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFY INDICATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FACIAL/PHYSICAL EXPRESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFFER TIME-OUT OR DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 2: OVERT BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PHYSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFY DISAPPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VERBAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFFER SUPPORT, TIME-OUT, DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EMOTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 3: ESCALATION</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- BEHAVIOURS BECOME MORE INTENSE, THREATENING HARMFUL</td>
<td>PHYSICAL INTERVENTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REMOVAL TO SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUGGEST SELF-CONTROL DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISOLATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 4: IMMERSION</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- BEHAVIOUR &quot;OUT OF CONTROL&quot; OR DELIBERATE/PLANNED</td>
<td>WAIT FOR SUBSIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VERBAL INTERACTION INDICATES COGNITION MAINTAINED</td>
<td>SUPERVISE/MONITOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD/DOCUMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENSURE SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 5: WITHDRAWAL/SUBSIDENCE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- OVERT BEHAVIOURS AND LANGUAGE LESSEN</td>
<td>CONTINUE TO MONITOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PHYSICAL &amp; BEHAVIOURAL WITHDRAWAL</td>
<td>VERBAL FEEDBACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RETURN TO STABLE, EMOTIONAL STATE</td>
<td>MAINTAIN SECURITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 6: HANGOVER</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EMOTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR INDICATE DEPRESSION, FEAR, SHAME, UNHAPPINESS</td>
<td>CONTINUE VERBAL REASSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TEARS AND REJECTION OF COMFORT LIKELY REMAINS WITHDRAWN</td>
<td>MAINTAIN SUPERVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENSURE SAFETY &amp; COMFORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 7: RECOVERY
- EMOTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR RETURN TO NORMAL STATE
- MAY INDICATE RELIEF, REGRET, GUILT
- WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS TANTRUM
- REDUCE ISOLATION
- ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION OF TRIGGERS AND CONSEQUENCES
- NOTIFY RETRIBUTION NECESSARY.

STAGE 8: RESTITUTION
- ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE TO BE REPAIRED/ REMOVED
- PHYSICAL DAMAGE TO OTHERS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED AND COMPENSATED
- NEGOTIATE OR DISCUSS MEANS OF RETRIBUTION FOR TIME LOST, DISTURBANCE ETC.
- DISCUSS REQUIRED RESTITUTION
- MONITOR/SUPERVISE REPARATION
- DOCUMENT AGREED RESTITUTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>HONEYMOON PERIOD (2 days to 2 weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Client observes, conforms, participates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Negative report seems unwarrented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 2</td>
<td>LIMIT TESTING (2 weeks to 2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rules and intervention consistency tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attempts to determine limits of staff tolerance, composure and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 3</td>
<td>ACTIVE RESISTANCE (1 - 3 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Client reverts completely to previously used behaviours - resists directions, rejects interpersonal closeness, hostile, overtly aggressive etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 4</td>
<td>TRUST AND ACHIEVEMENT BEGIN (1-2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistency and reasonableness of staff offer some hope/trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Efforts to interact and socialize with staff and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 5</td>
<td>PROGRAM ACCEPTANCE - PROGRESS (1 - 2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Achievements indicate a need to increase expectations and productivity for client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased self esteem and self control evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 6</td>
<td>DEMANDING AND POSSESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (3-6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uncertainty and unfamiliarity with relationships and success cause confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beginning of deeper relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 7</td>
<td>ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT (2-4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Client notices deviancy in others, takes responsibility, feels 'ownership' of centre/programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- motivation and success evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 8</td>
<td>SEPARATION AND REGRESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some insecurity and lack of confidence as expectations continue to increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Possible integration and partial separation causes concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 9</td>
<td>ATTACHMENT AND DEPARTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Progress to re-integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programmes successful and improved skills evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Client ready to return to formal placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Approximate Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensorimotor</td>
<td>0–2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperational</td>
<td>2–7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete operational</td>
<td>7–11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal operational</td>
<td>11–15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KOHLBERG'S CLASSIFICATIONS OF MORALEDVLOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Stage of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preconventional</td>
<td>Stage 1. Moral decisions are based on the desire to avoid punishment. Social norms are not violated because such actions will have unpleasant consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2. Moral decisions are based on the desire to obtain rewards. In this form of what Kohlberg called &quot;marketplace morality&quot;, the question is what is in it for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conventional</td>
<td>Stage 3. Moral decisions are based on a desire for social approval. This is the &quot;good boy&quot; or &quot;good girl&quot; orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 4. Morality is determined by those in authority. What is legal is moral. The social order must be maintained as an end in itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Postconventional</td>
<td>Stage 5. Morality is based on the assumption of a contract among members of a society to behave in an acceptable manner. The individual submits to a moral code designed to benefit the community as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 6. Moral decisions are based on self-chosen ethical principles directed toward promoting what is good for humanity as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACTORs CONTRIBUTING TO AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

INTERPERSONAL ENVIRONMENT
- PARENTS AND PEERS WITH VIOLENT OR AGGRESSIVE OR CRIMINAL BEHAVIOURS
- AGGRESSIVE SUCCESSFUL ROLE MODELS
- UNEMPLOYMENT
- LACK OF EDUCATION

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
- LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
- NOISE, POLLUTION, CROWDING
- STRESS
- POVERTY
- UNSTRUCTURED MILIEU (no regulation)

CULTURE/ETHNICITY
- MORES, VALUES, TRADITIONS, CULTURAL BELIEFS CONDONING AGGRESSION, SEXISM, RACISM, SUPPRESSION

ACCESS TO MEANS—GUNS, KNIVES, WEAPONS AVAILABLE

ACCESS TO VICTIMS—VULNERABLE OTHERS FRIENDS, WIVES, CHILDREN, AGED, PEERS, PUBLIC

DISINHIBITORS—DRUGS, ALCOHOL, PEERS
VIOLENCE AS LEARNED BEHAVIOUR

* ARE CHILDREN BORN EVIL?

*LEARNING = MOTIVATION+
             DEMONSTRATION+
             REINFORCEMENT+
             APPROVAL+
             PRACTICE

CONDITIONS FOR LEARNING
- RECEPTIVITY + OPPORTUNITY

* VIOLENCE TOWARDS CHILDREN CAN LEAD TO THE DEV’T OF ADULT VIOLENCE OR

* WITNESS TO VIOLENCE CAN LEAD TO PASSIVE, WITHDRAWN AND DEPRESSED BEH’R

* IMPACT OF MEDIA VIOLENCE
KEY FACTORS IN LEARNING ANY BEHAVIOUR

*INSTRUCTION + DEMONSTRATION

*OBSERVATION + ATTENTION

*PRACTISE / REHEARSAL

*FEEDBACK: # REINFORCEMENT
          # APPROVAL
          # PUNISHMENT
          # DISAPPROVAL

*MOTIVATION: # DESIRE TO ACHIEVE
               # DESIRE FOR ATTENTION
               # DESIRE FOR POWER

*ENVIRONMENT: # INHIBITORS
               # DISINHIBITORS
               # OPPORTUNITIES TO PERFORM
               # CAPACITY TO PERFORM
FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR

INTRA-AND INTER-PERSONAL FACTORS

PHYSIOLOGY
- GENDER, TEMPERAMENT
- HORMONES, CHROMOSOMES
- MENTAL DISORDER/DISABILITY
- PSYCHOPATHOLOGY

PERSONALITY
- IMPULSIVENESS
- LACK OF SELF CONTROL
- IMMATURE AFFECT (Egocentrism)
- LACK OF EMPATHY
- RISK-TAKING/THRILL SEEKING
- ANTI-SOCIAL BELIEF SYSTEMS

PSYCHOLOGY
- ATTRIBUTION THEORY
- LOCUS OF CONTROL
- DE-INDIVIDUATION THEORY
(football, army)
- SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY
MODULE 2
DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING A REMEDIAL BEHAVIOUR MONITORING PROGRAM

LEVEL 1: FOUNDATION STRATEGIES AND METHODS FOR DEVELOPING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN
For youth workers, teachers, counsellors engaged with youth in high security detention

LEVEL 2: SYSTEMS LEVEL BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT; STAFF COMPETENCIES FOR BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT
For senior executive and management overseeing staff engaged with youth in high security detention
MODULE 2: DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN
LEVEL 1: FOUNDATION STRATEGIES AND METHODS FOR DEVELOPING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

As a result of this module it is expected that participants will be able to:

2.1.1 demonstrate a capacity to gather data for use in the development of behaviour management program

2.1.2 analyse data to determine key objectives for a behaviour management program

2.1.3 explain individual differences and needs for behaviour management

2.1.4 design a behaviour management program reflecting appropriate principles and strategies for managing difficult behaviours

2.1.5 simulate the implementation of a behaviour management program
# Learning Unit: Designing a Behaviour Management Plan

## Module 2/Level 1 - Foundation Strategies and Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Topic</th>
<th>Session No:</th>
<th>Activity Duration</th>
<th>Required Resource</th>
<th>Content/Procedure/Key Points</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a Whole Unit Management Plan</td>
<td>PART A</td>
<td>2.15-2.45</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 4</td>
<td>Overview of key elements for consideration in unit management of behaviour; needs analysis; rules and codes of conduct.</td>
<td>3.1.5/3.4.2/3.4.7 3.1.4/3.2.5/3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Proposed Unit Management</td>
<td>PART B</td>
<td>2.45-3.15</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 2</td>
<td>Proposal for streamed management system, discussion/review and recording entry/exit criteria.</td>
<td>3.2.2/3.2.5/3.2.6 3.3.3/3.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills Development</td>
<td>PART C</td>
<td>3.15-3.4</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 4</td>
<td>Staff competencies checklist; management style; discussion intervention continuum.</td>
<td>3.1.1/3.4.8/3.1.3 3.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring Challenging Behaviour</td>
<td>PART D</td>
<td>4.00-4.30</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 10</td>
<td>Review of programmes/approaches currently available to manage challenging behaviours Glasser; Wragg; Goldstein; Jenkin</td>
<td>3.1.7/3.1.6/3.2.3/ 3.2.6/3.2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODULE 2  
LEVEL 1  
DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN  
FOUNDATION STRATEGIES AND METHODS  

PART A  
ESTABLISHING A WHOLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN  
Overview  
Rules/codes Of Conduct  
Documentation - Needs Analysis -  
complete (with reference to scenarios)  

PART B  
ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN  
Examination and Discussion of Key Elements  
Proposals for inclusion/writing criteria  

PART C  
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS DEVELOPMENT  
Staff Competencies Checklist  
Management Style  
Intervention Continuum  

BREAK  

PART D  
RESTRUCTURING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR  
Glasser  -  Group meetings  
Goldstein  -  Aggression Replacement Training  
Wragg  -  Talk Sense to Yourself  
Jenkin  -  (Resolve I and Resolve II)
MODULE 2: DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
LEVEL 2: LEVEL 1 CONTENT AND SYSTEMS LEVEL BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT
STAFF COMPETENCIES FOR BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

In addition to the objectives determined for level 1 of this module, on completion of level 2 it is expected that participants will be able to:

2.2.1 demonstrate a leadership role in developing an appropriate management system

2.2.2 demonstrate an effective communication style for discussing ineffective or inappropriate practices

2.2.3 analyse suggested interventions and give sound reasons for the inclusion/exclusion of such practices in a behaviour management plan

2.2.4 describe supportive and instructional procedures which may be implemented to improve the performance of team members

2.2.5 design appropriate documentation to support the behaviour management plan and record staff competencies.
**Learning Unit: DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**MODULE 2/LEVEL 2 - SYSTEMS LEVEL PLANNING/IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING TOPIC</th>
<th>SESSION NO:</th>
<th>ACTIVITY DURATION</th>
<th>REQUIRED RESOURCE</th>
<th>CONTENT/PROCEDURE/KEY POINTS</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTABLISHING &amp; MAINTAINING UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN</td>
<td>PART A</td>
<td>2.15-2.45</td>
<td>As listed</td>
<td>PART A content plus monitoring and responding to documentation (needs analysis)</td>
<td>6.1.1/6.1.2/6.1.5 6.1.6/6.3.2/6.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN</td>
<td>PART B</td>
<td>2.45-3.15</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 2</td>
<td>Key elements of proposed plan writing criteria staff supervision and management</td>
<td>6.4/6.1/6.2.1 6.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVISING INDIVIDUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN</td>
<td>PART C</td>
<td>3.15-3.45</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 4</td>
<td>Elements of planning; individual developmental needs applied behaviour analysis P.A.S.S. strategy</td>
<td>6.4.9/6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRUCTURING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>PART D</td>
<td>4.00-4.30</td>
<td>Worksheets provided x 10</td>
<td>Review of programmes/approaches available Glasser; Wragg; Goldstein; Jenkin</td>
<td>3.1.7/3.1.6/3.2.6/3.2.7/6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODULE 2 DESIGNING A BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME
LEVEL 2 SYSTEMS LEVEL PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

PART A ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING A WHOLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN
Overview
Inclusive Planning for Rules/Procedures
Monitoring and Responding to Documentation
(Needs analysis, Individual behaviour monitoring)

PART B ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN
Examination and Discussion of key elements
Proposals for inclusion/criteria/Development of Specific aspects of plan
Staff Supervision
Management considerations

PART C DEVISING INDIVIDUAL MANAGEMENT PLANS
Elements of Planning
Individual Education, Behaviour, Social Skills Plans
Baseline Data Collection/Analysis
(Quantitative/Qualitative)
Staff preparation for managing and supervising individuals
(P.A.S.S. strategy)

BREAK

PART D RESTRUCTURING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR
Glasser Goldstein
Wragg Jenkin
Review Programmes
Staff preparation
1. RULES ABOUT RULES

1. Rules are for clients, not for staff - therefore clients should know them

2. Rules should apply to all clients in the unit

3. Rules should be accessible to all clients in the unit - i.e. all clients should know about them, be able to read or explain them

4. Rules should be visible

5. Rules should be reinforced -
   - rewards and positive comments for compliance
   - some consequence for non-compliance

6. Rules should be specific and should identify things clients can actually do and achieve

7. Rules should relate to the people, activities and values of the unit - not the entire world

8. Rules should be compiled by clients, and unit staff together

9. Rules should rule, OK?

10. Rules are not philosophical statements, they are guidelines for behaviour.
MORE ABOUT RULES:

**SOME RULES ARE REAL RULES**

E.G. All unit members will have lights out at 9.30
No eating in recreation area
Only 2 visitors permitted at one time.

- These rules relate to procedures for organization
- They guide behaviour by being specific and non-negotiable
- They establish routines and procedures
- They do not assist clients in the development of internalized principles, values or attitudes - simply compliance
- They are necessary to the effective functioning of the unit
- Consequences for non-compliance usually involve application of punishment or immediate correction

Most organizations need both types of rules to function successfully.

**RULES ABOUT RULES:**

**SOMETIMES RULES DO NOT RULE BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT REALLY RULES:**

E.G. Unit members must be respectful at all times
Unit members must take care of unit property etc.

- These are actually statements which relate to sophisticated Principles of moral development such as respect for others, consideration, loyalty, responsibility, honesty etc.

- They are probably better described as codes of conduct/behaviour e.g. "Unit Code"

- They should be stated simply to be meaningful

- Consequence for non-compliance is disapproval by peers and staff and specific compliance training.
ROBINSON UNIT PROGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR MONITORING PLAN

The proposal is meant to offer a framework for the in-house development of a unit management plan. It attempts to take into consideration the key elements of supervision, documentation and specific behavioural criteria, to ensure a comprehensive system of management. The design of the plan is proposed in both the horizontal and vertical formats, with a supporting philosophy for each structural type. Although it may seem insignificant, a decision needs to be taken regarding the designation of each stage in the plan. This is particularly important in view of the unit philosophy of adopting a therapeutic and remedial approach, rather than a strictly punitive one.

Fundamental to the effectiveness of a unit-based behaviour management plan, is a consistent, predictable and objective set of guidelines, notified to all participants which establishes a specific pathway from entry to graduation. The removal of subjective and arbitrary decision-making on a day-to-day basis will be a major factor in the success of such a plan. When both clients and supervisors are familiar with the specific criteria established for movement through the plan in either a progressive or regressive direction, there is a greater probability of acceptance and compliance.
Problems arise when clients become aware that supervisors can arbitrarily move them to a different place (level) in the plan without consultation with other staff or the opportunity for the client to support his own case. It is therefore important that each position on the continuum be described in terms of exit and entry level behaviours. A supporting rationale for each component of the plan is suggested.

**Levels:**
The most common application of behaviour management plans in the more enlightened schools, detention centres, prisons and other institutions is some form of 'levels' system, loosely based on Glasser (1987). Generally this has meant that clients begin at a particular point on a scale and can progress forwards if successful or backwards if unsuccessful in demonstrating appropriate behaviours. The major problem with such an approach is that it has traditionally been based on a punitive model. Clients who commit a misdemeanor are placed at a lower level, have reduced privileges and are aware of the disapproval of staff. While it may be perfectly legitimate to 'punish' clients who engage in misdemeanors, it is neither therapeutically nor practically useful to leave the intervention at this point. Misdemeanors are a clear indication that the client requires more intensive supervision, training and support to achieve the established criteria of behaviour. This is unlikely to occur spontaneously as a result of punishment, exclusion and disapproval.
Rather, in a therapeutic milieu, the misdemeanour must be interpreted as an indicator of a need for specific and intensive training intervention. For this reason it is suggested that a horizontal description of the plan may be more relevant than the vertical. The horizontal format suggests that, rather than being moved to a lower level, the client is moved sideways along a continuum of intensity of intervention. In other words, he is not punished for his behavioural incompetencies, he is given the opportunity to address the deficiencies and receive guidance in improvement. The rationale for the plan discussed here is a gradual increase or decrease in the intensity of supervision, support, and independence, as a direct result of client performance. By contrast the vertical format, particularly if labeled using numbers, can be interpreted as simply moving inexorably lower and lower down a scale to failure, which accounts for the fact that some clients will more through all levels in a day.

Whether the vertical or horizontal/continuum is used, criteria must be established for movement through the 'levels' with specific time periods determined before the next move. This gives unit personnel the opportunity to deliver programs at each 'level' which should preclude further deterioration, and ensure progress.

This stipulation also ensures that clients are seen to be treated fairly and consistently in terms of movement and have the opportunity to present a defence for movement through the plan, in either direction.
'Levels' can be numerically named, or as suggested in this plan, be colour coded in such a way as to demonstrate movement towards a 'green' or successful direction or towards 'red' for less successful behaviours. Colour coding of documentation to support this movement provides a visual record of progress. Suggested level colours are (most successful to least):
dark green, jade, pale green, aqua, blue,
entry level - 'white'.
beige, yellow, pink, orange, red.

**STAGES:** It can be anticipated that clients will move through a number of psychoeducational stages during the program. The stages in this plan are labeled to indicate the level of independence achieved in terms of acceptable behaviours and the levels of dependency and support needed when behaviours are inappropriate.

**ENTRY(WHITE)** Movement from this level in either direction will be based on specified criteria and should not proceed until the initial "honeymoon" or "testing" periods have been completed.

The client remains at this stage for a lengthy period (say one month) to provide the opportunity for assessment, determination of specific objectives and program planning. It is suggested that at a minimum the following programs be offered at an individualized level.

**Individual Education Program IEP** based on educational and vocational assessment.
Individual Social Skills Plan (ISSP) based on observational data of needs in the area of social interaction skills, hygiene and independence.

Individual Interpersonal Skills Plan (IISP) devised to develop personal competencies in conflict resolution, anger and aggression management, negotiation, safety, assertiveness etc.

Individual Behaviour Plan (IBP) based on systematic data collection (quantitative and qualitative) and prioritization of needs and deficiencies.

Each program requires specific skills acquisition, competencies and delivery documentation.

The remainder of the positive stages involve full attendance in the unit with diminishing levels of support.

**PROGRESSIVE STAGES PROGRAM DELIVERY**

This involves programs from a unit based and delivered set of programs to a relocation of partial or full program into the integrated setting, with unit staff support to begin with, specific training in generalization, transfer of programs to the integrated setting and ultimately a preparation for graduation.

UNIT PROGRAM (BLUE) This stage represents a functional performance in all unit programs, demonstration of competencies and progress for a sustained period prior to integration.
VISITS PROGRAM (AQUA)  This stage offers the client the opportunity to take part in out-of-unit programs, activities and events in preparation for further integration. This would probably entail more social than vocational or educational activities to afford the opportunity for social inclusion and interaction as a preliminary to more structured and demanding integration performance.

PARTIAL INTEGRATION (PALE GREEN)  This stage represents a supported integration into the host environment with unit personnel input.

INTEGRATION WITH GENERALIZATION (JADE)  This stage is completed when the client can demonstrate successful behavioural and program performance at the integrated placement, without unit personnel supervision. Such successful performance would indicate internalization of the behavioural principles necessary for sustained attendance outside the unit.

GRADUATION (DARK GREEN)  This stage represents the most advanced stage and is reached after the client has successfully moved through four other stages of support; supervision and individual programs;
REGRESSIVE STAGES PROGRAM DELIVERY

This follows an intensive plan of maintenance of the individualized programs within the whole group setting, through to intensified delivery in a small group or team and then to intensive individual programs with the possibility of adjunctive programs which may include a health or mental health focus.

RESISTANT: (BEIGE) This stage will be evident when the client begins to or continues to resist directives, program goals and peers or personnel. Movement into this level should be as a result of specific documented criteria.

ACTIVE RESISTANT (YELLOW) This stage represents a more severe level of resistance requiring a greater degree of supervision and support. Criteria to be established.

REJECTION WITHDRAWAL (PINK) At this stage it is anticipated that a high degree of non-compliance refusal to participate, deliberate attempts to damage and injury, would be consistently evident. Criteria to be established.
PRE-SUSPENSION CONTRACT (ORANGE)  This stage indicates a very high level of support and supervision necessary with inclusion to an intensive individual program necessary, with minimal contact with peers. Criteria to be established.

IN-UNIT SUSPENSION (RED)  At this stage the client is fully and intensively supervised and supported and isolated from peers.

SUPERVISION

A major factor in survival and progress in juvenile detention programs is the supervision offered to support the client. The assumption cannot be made in this plan that the client is capable of the degree of self-control and self-direction necessary to ensure their own survival and progress. Indeed, a major focus of the plan must be to offer the closest supervision possible, contingent upon performance and compliance. The plan provides for progressively increased supervision for clients in a regressive phase, leading to a one-to-one "buddy" or "minder" supervision plan. It is anticipated that this be provided by a professional rather than a peer, although this is an aspect of the plan could be explored. The level of supervision moves from close through partial to basic for progressive clients and from close through to close with buddy for regressive clients.
PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Full details of a proposed methodology for recording progress in the acquisition and demonstration of appropriate behaviours follow under "frequency". The monitoring of performance must relate to specifically stated criteria. This part of the plan describes the degree of responsibility afforded the client in the recording of his behaviour, and indicates a reduced level of independence and responsibility for clients in a regressive phase. This is partly due to the likelihood that clients in further stages of regression are unlikely to be compliant enough to perform the monitoring procedure, and also because of the possibility of destruction of records during tantrums or aggressive episodes. Nevertheless, it is preferable that as far as possible clients be given the opportunity to at the very least observe the monitoring and record keeping of their progress, and at best, be given responsibility for their own record keeping under supervision or through periodic checking.

FREQUENCY

It is strongly recommended that clients be involved in systematic, consistent, predictable and frequent recording of their behavioural progress. As the client moves through the plan towards less desirable behaviours it is important that he be given more frequent feedback and guidelines and therefore greater opportunity to make appropriate choices for improvement.
Conversely, as his behavioural repertoire improves, he will require less frequent recording of progress as he moves towards greater independence and integration. It is suggested that it is essential for this degree of documentation to be established in order that accountability for client welfare, progress and support be verifiable. It is also important that such documentation be secure and housed in specially devised units or on a secure computer disc. The diagram illustrates a proposed schedule for frequency of monitoring and recording satisfaction of criteria for appropriate behaviour. Fundamentally, the record will indicate, at the most regressive level, the state of the clients compliance, control, etc. every 15 minutes. Should the client be non compliant, uncontrolled etc., (criteria to be determined), then he will not receive a check for that period. The record will indicate at a glance the level of compliance and changes for better or worse.

Sample record at In-Unit Suspension Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>9-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

records four 15 minutes periods of compliant behaviour, in each hour
Movement to 1/2 hourly intervals through to hourly, and so on to weekly depends on consistently achieving 85% compliance for a set period at each level. Sample recording format appended.

Each component of the suggested plan needs to be thoroughly examined and described, particularly regarding the criteria to be established for movement between levels. It is suggested that movement to a different level be dependent upon:

1. satisfaction of stated criteria
2. case conference and interview
3. review of relevant documentation
4. specified time period at each level.

The plan is a suggested framework for systematic recording, monitoring and delivery of programs. Having thus established a basic foundation, the necessity for staff to make individual arbitrary decisions is removed leaving them free to implement the plan consistently and build up firm relationships with clients. Such a framework also negates the intensity of emotions often exhibited when individual decisions regarding interventions are delivered and rejected or disputed by clients.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>SUPERVISION</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MONITORING</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 DARK GREEN</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 JADE</td>
<td>Integration with generalization</td>
<td>Transfer of programs (out of unit)</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Twice Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PALE GREEN</td>
<td>Partial integration with supervision</td>
<td>Generalization training unit (unit consultation)</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Supervised/ self</td>
<td>3 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AQUA</td>
<td>Visits program</td>
<td>Generalization training (support)</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>4 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BLUE</td>
<td>Unit program</td>
<td>Individual/ whole group</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRESSIVE STAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTRY (1 MONTH)</th>
<th>STABILIZATION IN UNIT</th>
<th>DEVELOP. INDIV. PROGRAMS</th>
<th>CLOSE</th>
<th>SUPERVISED/ SELF</th>
<th>TWICE DAILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IEP/ ISSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IISP/ BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHOLE GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGRESSIVE STAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 BRISE</th>
<th>Resistant</th>
<th>Maintained Whole group</th>
<th>Close/Buddy/ observed</th>
<th>Supervised/ Self</th>
<th>3 times daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 YELLOW</td>
<td>Active resistant</td>
<td>Intensified small group</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>Hourly interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 PINK</td>
<td>Rejection/ withdrawal</td>
<td>Intensified individual adjunctive</td>
<td>Close/Buddy/ observed</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>1/2 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ORANGE</td>
<td>Pre-suspension contract</td>
<td>Individual adjunctive</td>
<td>Close/Buddy/ observed</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>1/4 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 RED</td>
<td>In-unit suspension</td>
<td>Individual adjunctive</td>
<td>Close/Buddy/ observed</td>
<td>Supervised/ Self</td>
<td>1/4 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IEP
INDIVIDUAL SOCIAL SKILLS PROGRAM ISSP
INDIVIDUAL INTERPERSONAL SKILLS PROGRAM IISP
INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR PROGRAM ISP
SKILLS ACQUISITION, COMPETENCIES MET, DOCUMENTATION
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### PROGRESSIVE STAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL STAGE</th>
<th>DARK GREEN Graduation</th>
<th>JADE Integration with generalization</th>
<th>PALE GREEN Partial integration</th>
<th>AQUA Visits program</th>
<th>BLUE Unit program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>Preparation out of unit</td>
<td>Transfer of programs out of unit</td>
<td>Generalization training with (unit consultancy)</td>
<td>Generalization training with unit staff</td>
<td>Individual in whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic and chaperoned</td>
<td>Partial relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
<td>Supervised self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Twice weekly</td>
<td>Three times weekly</td>
<td>Four times weekly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gradual decrease in supervision

Monitoring and program attendance

Increases in freedom, peer contact and independence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTRY STABILIZATION</th>
<th>BEIGE Resistant</th>
<th>YELLOW Active resistant</th>
<th>PINK Rejection withdrawal</th>
<th>ORANGE Pre-suspension</th>
<th>RED In unit suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Individualiz'd Programs &amp; maintain</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>Intensified</td>
<td>Intensified Adjunctive</td>
<td>Intense Adjunctive</td>
<td>Intense Adjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole group</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
<td>Small Group</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td>Supervised Self</td>
<td>Supervised Observed Or Self</td>
<td>Supervised Observed</td>
<td>Supervised Observed</td>
<td>Supervised Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice Daily</td>
<td>Three times daily</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Half hourly</td>
<td>Quarter hourly</td>
<td>Quarter hourly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- stable -
regression
Increases in supervision, monitoring and program attendance
Decreases in freedom, peer contact, independence
GENERALIZATION TRAINING

The transfer of newly acquired skills from the site of original training to other sites is a major consideration and concern for professionals working with disabled or incarcerated young people. It can be baffling and disheartening to find that skills which have become well-established on-site are lost when the client returns to the regular setting or is required to perform them in settings other than the training setting. Generalization for these clients rarely occurs spontaneously - it must be structured into the original training procedure. Unless generalization training is programmed to accompany procedures in a special setting, behaviours learned in such programmes are not likely to be generalized. (Sulzer, Azaroff, Mayer 1977) There is no doubt that full preparation of clients in a rehabilitation (i.e. the skills have been lost) or habititative programme (i.e. the skills were never there) must include a number of considerations:

1. **Common Elements:**

   It is important to identify and utilize the common elements between settings - these could include:

   - environment - (location, surroundings, furnishing, layout, facilities etc)
   - personnel - (in similar roles, who operate across settings, familiar etc)
   - programmes - (social skills, educational, vocational recreational, behaviour, personal)
   - organization - (staff rights and responsibility, client rights and responsibilities, schedules, rules etc).

2. **Range of Settings**

   It is preferable to establish the target behaviour across settings or in a range of locations to begin with, rather than training for compliance of success in one setting and then attempting to generalize to other settings. This could mean that, for example, 'eye contact' and a verbal response would always be required when the client is greeted whether he is inside the unit, in a classroom, visiting administration, during recreation etc. This obviously necessitates preparation and practice across various time slots as well as situations.

3. **Range of Trainers**

   Similarly it is most important that the client be trained to respond appropriately with a number of personnel, both familiar and unfamiliar throughout training. This affords the opportunity for 'resilience' training also, whereby the client is taught that different members of staff will respond to him in different ways, but that the required response is still appropriate. For example, some staff will greet clients quite formally, whilst others may joke or offer a physical greeting (hand shake, pat an arm etc) - clients who come to the realization that their skills are widely applicable also tend to acquire new skills without training in these situations. This necessitates the preparation of a range of staff members so that practice is maintained for the client.
4. Reinforcement

Initially, demonstration of the appropriate behaviour will require regular reinforcement for maintenance in the specialized setting. To facilitate maintenance in the new or other setting(s), intermittent reinforcement should be introduced once the behaviour is established. A variety of reinforcements need to be employed such as proximity, verbal physical, etc. It is important to identify the reinforcers which are most effective for particular clients, behaviours and situations and to vary delivery in terms of time, intensity and frequency.
REMEDIAL BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT LEVELS SYSTEMS - ADVANTAGES:

1. CLEAR EXPECTATIONS

2. OPPORTUNITY TO CAREFULLY TARGET REMEDIATION

3. ALL STUDENTS/CLIENTS INCLUDED

4. PROGRESSION AT INDIVIDUAL RATE

5. SYSTEMATICALLY REINFORCES BEHAVIOUR

6. PROGRESSION AND REGRESSION DOCUMENTED

7. NOT BASED ON PUNITIVE MEASURES

8. INTROSPECTION LEADS TO GENERALISATION WITH TRAINING

9. INDEPENDENCE DEVELOPS/INTRINSIC MOTIVATION

10. CLIENTS UNDERSTAND/ACCEPT /RESPECT THE PROCESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>STAFF MEMBER</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CLIENT/STUDENT</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>OTHER PERSON</th>
<th>Reason Given</th>
<th>Response Requested or Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal/Social</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intruder:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare &amp; Discipline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeout:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susp/Excl/Expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home/School Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>OPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>TPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason Given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention Pref.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itinerant Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behav. Mang't Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approp. Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic/Remed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remedial Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Help Seeking/Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (Police/Doctor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>OPG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>TPY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response Requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or Sought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.A.R.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flight/Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment:</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIOLENT INCIDENT NEEDS ANALYSIS

RATIONALE:

The Violent Incidents Needs Analysis recording form has been devised to provide a summary document following a violent incident in an educational setting, including schools, detention facilities and community care placements. The form summarises the elements of the setting which are seen as relevant to the incident as a means of determining what interventions are operational and effective as well as those needed. The report of the incident itself is provided separately by the participants or observers and this form is completed at the same time to record responses and elements which may have impacted on the outcome.

The form is organised in several columns and lists elements of the category which were in place in the organisation, were applied in response to the incident or which are needed in view of the incident. All are important to management of the violent incident:

ORGANISATION includes:

POLICIES (OP) such as: a documented welfare and discipline policy
a restraint policy
a timeout policy including a specific location available
corporal punishment as permitted under recent government guidelines
suspension/exclusion/expulsion provisions
supervision rosters relevant to the incident

PERSONNEL (OPL) includes:

Individuals and groups involved in the incident who are legitimate members of the community in which the incident occurred such as:
counsellor
Itinerant Support Teacher
Executive Support (principal, Deputy etc)
teacher
Grievance Committee members
Discipline committee members
external personnel such as police and medical
PROGRAMMES (OPG) include:

Programmes offered within the setting, or needed to deal with the incident including:
- behaviour remediation programmes
- social skills programmes
- Anti-violence curricula
- debriefing procedures for staff and students/clients
- rules and procedures known to all

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS (OE) including

Elements of the physical surrounding s of the organisation which may have impacted on, facilitated or inhibited the incident:
- broad physical elements such as perimeter fencing, gates
- immediate physical elements such as hidden locations,
- unsupervised locations, dangerous features
- security measures
- safety measures and regulations

In the event of a violent incident the recorder will determine whether the element was in place and applied or utilised to address the incident, or is an element that should be developed for future management. For example:
If during the course of the incident no supervision was available in the location then the setting probably needs a supervision policy and roster to avoid or address future incidents;
if during the course of, or following the incident no counselling service was available then this may need to be established.

STAFF MEMBER (often a teacher) refers to interpersonal and intra-personal attributes of the staff involved in the incident to determine if further training in skills or awareness levels needs to be offered:

PERSONAL SKILLS (TP)

Elements of individual personnel skills and interpersonal orientations and preferences which may have impacted on the management of the incident for better or worse outcomes are assessed in this section. This requires a degree of introspection which may be difficult or challenging for the individual doing the self-assessment and may be further distressing for an individual assessing a colleague. Nevertheless the process is valuable in terms of determining how future incidents could be responded to. This section includes:
- level of assertiveness shown
- level of self-control demonstrated
- types of body language which may defuse or escalate the situation
- management style including authoritarian, authoritative and laissez-faire approaches
- stress levels and management: self esteem etc.
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (TPP)

Professional skills and practices which may have influenced or impacted on the incident are assessed in this section. These include:
- Intervention style preference such as Interventionist, non-Interventionist, Interactionist
- Communication styles and preferences
- Behaviour management skills and plans in place
- Appropriate teaching programmes including individualisation for some
- Diagnostic/remedial skills for those in need
- Help-seeking skills and strategies as well as accessibility to students or clients

PHYSICAL RESPONSE SKILLS (TPY)

Having undertaken a physical response course may facilitate intervention in such an incident and these include:
- Evasive Self Defence (Bowie, 1990)
- Professional Aggression Response Training (Smith, 1988)
- Preparedness to undertake flight/retreat response if necessary

CLIENT / STUDENT

Similarly the skills and strategies of the client/student involved in the incident or another staff member if this is the case are assessed in this section:

PERSONAL /SOCIAL SKILLS (SP)

The capacities of the student/client in terms of their social and interpersonal functioning may have an important role in the resolution or escalation of the incident. These include:
- Interpersonal interaction skills
- Communication style and preference
- Self-control
- Conflict resolution skills or training undertaken or needed
- Home/school liaison – quality and processes
ACADEMIC (SA)

Lack of achievement or recognition in the educational program offered may impact on the attitudes and responses of the individual involved and need to be assessed to determine if remedial intervention could or should or has effected the incident.

- reading /maths/writing skills
- appropriate individualised program in place/needed
- known remedial needs addressed or needing attention
- vocational training needed or offered

BEHAVIOUR (SB)

Knowledge of the behavioural needs of the client or student involved includes:

- classroom or education facility behavioural adequacy
- recreational settings behavioural adequacy
- relationships with peers
- relationships with teachers or others in authority

OTHER PERSON

This refers to the situation in which another person, not a member of the education community is involved in the incident. This could include an intruder into the setting from the general community, a former student or client who returns and engages in violent behaviour, a parent or other adult, a visitor to the setting or individual on a professional visit to the setting. Their involvement needs to be recorded although no assessment of the relevant elements addressed above is possible.

As an outcome of completing the form, the incident may contribute the establishment of more appropriate or more effective intervention and responses.
UNIT MEETINGS (BASED ON GLASSER)

MAJOR AIMS:

1. To increase involvement between the staff and clients and among clients themselves. (Involvement is an important way to motivate co-operation)

2. To develop in clients, a "success identity" as they contribute to unit meetings and are listened to.

3. To develop clients' confidence and skills in expressing their ideas and opinions.

4. To develop clients' listening skills as they listen to each other.

5. To develop in clients, socially responsible attitudes (e.g. concern for others), and socially responsible behaviours (e.g. respecting the ideas, opinions, and feelings of others).

6. To develop co-operative ways of solving problems which affect individual unit members or the unit as a whole. (This also helps clients feel that they "belong" to the class).

7. To give the opportunity for clients to lead peers, teach peers, discuss with peers in an acceptable way.

8. To provide the opportunity for clients to feedback to staff, concerns and issues in unit procedures.

9. To provide the opportunity for clients to contribute to unit management.
GUIDELINES FOR LEADING UNIT MEETINGS (FROM GLASSER)

A. ORGANIZATIONAL GUIDELINES

1. Form a tight circle with no furniture in the middle. Plan with your clients a way to effectively and quickly arrange furniture.

2. If necessary, plan a seating arrangement which will promote good discussion and the least pupil-to-pupil distraction. (For example, plan with "disturbers" to sit apart or next to staff.)

3. Staff member should sit in a different place in the circle for each meeting.

4. Meetings of 15-20 minutes duration should be manageable with older students depending on maturity and interest. As growth occurs, meetings will gradually lengthen.

5. Meetings should be held on a regular timetabled basis. Every day is best, but at least once a week is necessary for clients to benefit from them.

6. Experiment with the best time of day to have meetings.

7. Utilize hand-raising in the beginning and whenever necessary or comfortable to facilitate discussion.

8. Establish rules early - no derogatory comments towards others; do not tolerate disruptive behaviours; one person to speak at a time.

9. Take time to listen and give positive feedback for early attempts to communicate views, opinions, concerns.

10. Distractors should be excluded from the larger group but should be required to attend a meeting with smaller group. If still not able to comply - individual meeting run on same lines should be held until compliance promised/demonstrated.
B. LEADERSHIP GUIDELINES

1. Show warmth and enthusiasm. Clients become aware that you really care about listening to them.

2. Be non-judgmental; there are no right or wrong answers in unit meetings. To encourage deeper thinking on an issue, ask, "What do the rest of you think of that idea?"

3. Set simple ground rules; e.g. - one person talks at a time; everyone's opinion is to be respected, although not necessarily agreed with and can be challenged. Keep comments constructive.

4. During the first several meetings especially, keep the atmosphere comfortable and provide support through as much direction as needed. This directiveness will gradually taper off as clients grow to trust the meeting atmosphere and secure more self-direction. For some groups, this may take several months.

5. Develop the art of questioning.

Refrain from repeating and rephrasing answers.
Limit staff interruptions whenever possible
Do not correct poor grammar during the discussions.

6. If discussion is especially involved when it's time to stop, this could be a good place to start the next meeting.

7. Work with another staff member to get ideas and obtain feedback on how you're doing.

8. It is probably advisable to hold unit meetings with two staff members present.

9. Unit meetings are an ideal time to congratulate members moving progressively through the streams and offer support to members moving regressively through.

10. Remember: 'When the best leaders work is done the people say we did it ourselves”

Lao Tse
REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

1. Good clients may be reluctant to talk; often they are uncomfortable with no "right" answers.

2. At the beginning, clients may give answers they think staff want to hear. It takes time to build an atmosphere of trust where clients will say what they really think.

3. Clients will probably direct most of their responses to staff member. Again it takes time (and skillful guidance from the staff member) for the clients to learn to talk with each other and the group.

4. Clients will get excited by some topics and tend to talk together in sub-groups.... just as adults do.

5. Some clients may initially try to disrupt meetings. Often this is a way out of an unfamiliar situation, and ceases as they grow comfortable with the format, and become involved in the discussion.

6. Unit meetings rarely produce miracles. Growth is gradual and comes with experience through consistent efforts. Become aware of small increments of success. Above all, don't give up!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed behaviour</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinders another member from completing a statement</td>
<td>INTERRUPTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes funny comments, and makes others laugh</td>
<td>CLOWNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately undermines a project</td>
<td>WHITEANTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes cynical remarks about the group's efforts</td>
<td>DISPARAGING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resists stubbornly</td>
<td>BLOCKING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROBINSON UNIT PROGRAM

(After Goldstein and Pentz 1984).

Jean B Jenkin

1. INDIVIDUAL SKILL DEFICIENCY

1.1 Lack of Knowledge - Client needs
   1.1.1 knowledge of appropriate goals for social interaction
   1.1.2 knowledge of appropriate strategies to reach the goals
   1.1.3 knowledge of the appropriate context for strategies to be employed.

1.2 Lack of Behavioural Competency
   1.2.1 lack of specific behaviours required
   1.2.2 inability to activate skills and knowledge

1.3 Lack of Introspection
   1.3.1 lack of awareness of self and own level of competency
   1.3.2 lack of ability to monitor and evaluate own behaviour
   1.3.3 inability to correctly attribute Success and failure in the skill to their own competency
2. RECEPTIVITY TO PRESENTATION FORMAT / STYLE

Motivation of the student may depend on:

2.1 adapting the new format to suit the clientele (adolescent, low I.Q., aggressive, depressed etc.)

2.2 structure of the components - length of session; variety of presentation, methods (concrete role play etc.); reliance of topics, presenter and style

2.3 negotiation of content - both trainer and trainee selected skills should be included

2.4 timing of sessions
   - should be reinforcing;
   - retry from a disliked activity or more academic activity
   - as follow up to a specific incident to support client

2.5 order of skills presentation
   - simple to complex; known to unknown
   - reinforcement potential
   - skills should be immediately applicable following ease of learning, leading to early rewards for displaying the skills

3. TRANSFER AND MAINTENANCE (GENERALIZATION)

3.1 specific transfer enhancement procedures and approaches need to be incorporated

3.2 treatment and practice - relevant situation - relevant situation

3.3 specific generalization - training

4. INFLUENCE OF DEVELOPMENTAL CAPACITIES

4.1 knowledge of the developmental levels of clients in the cognitive, moral, effective domains

4.2 awareness of social context, familial influences, role models, sex-roles, identification on client

4.3 exploration and identification of key peer influences in client behaviour repertoire
5.1 awareness of group dynamics with which the client is faced

5.2 group size, leadership, changes to membership will influence client and may impact
   - social skills recognition

5.3 awareness of emergence of group cohesiveness

5.4 sensitivity and responsiveness to group energy communication and support patterns
RESPONSE CONTINUUM FOR BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT
JEAN B. JENKIN

INTERVENTIONIST RESPONSES

AUTHORITARIAN MODELS

CANTER "ASSERTIVE" DISCIPLINE

SKINNER CONDITIONED RESPONSES

INTERACTIONIST RESPONSES

PEDAGOGICAL MODELS

Goldstein 'A.R.T.'

Jenkin 'Resolve II'

Hillwalker 'Accepts'


BEHAVIOURIST MODELS

INDIVIDUAL/COGNITIVE MODELS

Balson 'Logical Consequences'

Wragg 'Talk Sense'

Glasser 'Reality Therapy'

NON-INTERVENTIONIST RESPONSES

LAISSEZ-FAIRE MODELS

A.S. NEILL SUMMERHILL UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGING CHALLENGING BEHAVIOURS

ROGERS 'CLIENT-CENTRED THERAPY'

GORDON 'MORPHOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS'
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APPENDICES, WORKSHEETS AND HANDOUTS FOR PARTICIPANTS
Psychoeducational Stage 1: The Honeymoon Stage—2 Days to 2 Weeks

Psychoeducational Stage 2: Limit Testing—2 Weeks to 2 Months

Psychoeducational Stage 3: Active Resistance—1 to 3 Months

Psychoeducational Stage 4: Beginning Trust and Achievement—2 Weeks to 1 Month

Psychoeducational Stage 5: Program Acceptance and Progress—3–8 Weeks

Psychoeducational Stage 6: Negative Personal Demands and Intense Jealousy—3–6 Weeks

Psychoeducational Stage 7: Clear Academic and Social Improvement—2 to 4 Weeks

Psychoeducational Stage 8: Separation and Regression

Psychoeducational Stage 9: The Expression of Genuine Feelings of Attachment and Sadness—Saying Goodbye
THE CONFLICT CYCLE

NICHOLAS LONG

The Pupil's Conflict Cycle
Figure 1. The Assault Cycle (Adapted from Smith)

- **The Triggering Event**
  This is an occurrence perceived by the individual as a serious threat to them; their perception, not the reality of the event, is the key factor. Triggering events fall into two main types, those of fear and frustration.
  
  1) **Fear inducing events** give the person the perception that they are under threat or are to be deprived of something they value.
  2) **Frustrating circumstances** give the person the idea that their efforts or demands have been useless or ignored.

- **Escalation Phase**
  The person's body and mind prepare to fight. They take a physical stance ready for action and may taunt the perceived threat, if it is a person.

- **Crisis Point**
  The aggressor explodes into violent acts against the threat.

- **Recovery Phase**
  The body relaxes and the mind decreases its vigilance, the confrontation is seen to be over, even if only temporarily.

- **Post-Crisis Depression**
  While the body and mind try to return to a stable base level, the physical and emotional aspects of the crisis reappear in this phase often as fatigue, depression and guilt.
Figure 1. The Assault Cycle (Adapted from Smith)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENTS GOAL BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>ATTACKING BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>DEFENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention seeking</td>
<td>The clown</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The nuisance</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The smart alec</td>
<td>Speech problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The show-off</td>
<td>Bashful or shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtrusive/loud</td>
<td>Untidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>Self-indulgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking question mark</td>
<td>Excessively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibitionism/self harm</td>
<td>Frivolous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Argues</td>
<td>Unco-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>Dawdles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradicts</td>
<td>Disobedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>Forgetful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temper tantrums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untruthful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disobedient (carries out forbidden acts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>Sullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicious</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destructive</td>
<td>Morose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>Passive hatred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent/hurts others</td>
<td>Refuses to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Aggressive</td>
<td>Interrupts</td>
<td>Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologises</td>
<td>Idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whines</td>
<td>Incapable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blames others</td>
<td>'Hopeless'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finds fault</td>
<td>Juvenile ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self centred</td>
<td>Won't mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fantasy activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Classification of Behaviours with Undesirable Goals
ANALYSIS OF TYPES OF CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR
SCENARIOS RECORDING FORMAT

INCIDENT:

BEHAVIOURS OBSERVED/NOTED

STAFF RESPONSE

INTERPRETATION:

CLIENT PURPOSE

TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR
TEMPER TANTRUM MODEL (ADAPTED FROM TRESICHMAN)

INDICATORS                        INTERVENTION

STAGE 1:  RUMBLING & GRUMBLING - NOTIFY INDICATORS
          - DISCONTENT EVIDENT- OFFER TIME-OUT
          - DRIBBLING OR DISCUSSION
          - FACIAL/PHYSICAL EXPRESSIONS

STAGE 2:  OVERT BEHAVIOUR
          - PHYSICAL
          - VERBAL
          - EMOTIONAL
          - NOTIFY DISAPPROVAL
          - OFFER SUPPORT,
          - TIME-OUT, DISCUSSION

STAGE 3:  ESCALATION
          - BEHAVIOURS BECOME MORE
          - INTENSE, THREATENING
          - HARMFUL
          - PHYSICAL
          - INTERVENTION
          - REMOVAL TO SAFETY
          - SUGGEST SELF-
          - CONTROL DECISION
          - ISOLATION

STAGE 4:  IMMERSION
          - BEHAVIOUR "OUT OF
          - CONTROL," OR DELIBERATE/
          - PLANNED
          - VERBAL INTERACTION
          - INDICATES COGNITION
          - MAINTAINED
          - WAIT FOR SUBSIDENCE
          - SUPERVISE/MONITOR
          - RECORD/DOCUMENT
          - ENSURE SAFETY

STAGE 5:  WITHDRAWAL/SUBSIDENCE
          - OVERT BEHAVIOURS AND
          - LANGUAGE LESSEN
          - PHYSICAL & BEHAVIOURAL
          - WITHDRAWAL
          - RETURN TO STABLE,
          - EMOTIONAL STATE
          - CONTINUE TO
          - MONITOR
          - VERBAL FEEDBACK
          - MAINTAIN SECURITY

STAGE 6:  HANGOVER
          - EMOTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR
          - INDICATE DEPRESSION,
          - FEAR, SHAME, UNHAPPINESS
          - CONTINUE VERBAL
          - REASSURANCE
          - MAINTAIN
          - SUPERVISION
          - TEARS AND REJECTION
          - OF COMFORT LIKELY
          - ENSURE SAFETY &
          - REMAINS WITHDRAWN
          - COMFORT
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STAGE 7: RECOVERY
- EMOTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR RETURN TO NORMAL STATE
- MAY INDICATE RELIEF, REGRET, GUILT
- WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS TANTRUM
- REDUCE ISOLATION
- ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION OF TRIGGERS AND CONSEQUENCES
- NOTIFY RETRIBUTION NECESSARY.

STAGE 8: RESTITUTION
- ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE TO BE REPAIRED/ REMOVED
- PHYSICAL DAMAGE TO OTHERS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED AND COMPENSATED
- NEGOTIATE OR DISCUSS MEANS OF RETRIBUTION FOR TIME LOST, DISTURBANCE ETC.
- DISCUSS REQUIRED RESTITUTION
- MONITOR/SUPERVISE REPARATION
- DOCUMENT AGREED RETRIBUTION
ROBINSON UNIT TRAINING PROGRAMME

(JEAN B. JENKIN)

PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL STAGES (from N. Long 1986)

STAGE 1  HONEYMOON PERIOD (2 days to 2 weeks)
- Client observes, conforms, participates
- Negative report seems unwarranted

STAGE 2  LIMIT TESTING (2 weeks to 2 months)
- Rules and intervention consistency tested
- Attempts to determine limits of staff tolerance, composure and effectiveness

STAGE 3  ACTIVE RESISTANCE (1 - 3 months)
- Client reverts completely to previously used behaviours - resists directions, rejects interpersonal closeness, hostile, overtly aggressive etc.

STAGE 4  TRUST AND ACHIEVEMENT BEGIN (1-2 months)
- Consistency and reasonableness of staff offer some hope/trust
- Efforts to interact and socialize with staff and peers

STAGE 5  PROGRAM ACCEPTANCE - PROGRESS (1 - 2 months)
- Achievements indicate a need to increase expectations and productivity for client
- Increased self esteem and self control evident

STAGE 6  DEMANDING AND POSSESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (3-6 weeks)
- Uncertainty and unfamiliarity with relationships and success cause confusion
- Beginning of deeper relationships

STAGE 7  ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT (2-4 weeks)
- Client notices deviancy in others, takes responsibility, feels 'ownership' of centre/programmes
- Motivation and success evident

STAGE 8  SEPARATION AND REGRESSION
- Some insecurity and lack of confidence as expectations continue to increase
- Possible integration and partial separation causes concern

STAGE 9  ATTACHMENT AND DEPARTURE
- Progress to re-integrator
- Programmes successful and improved skills evident
- Client ready to return to formal placement.
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WORKSHEET

DEVELOPMENTAL LEVELS:

MORAL DEVELOPMENT (KOHLBERG)

Stage 1

Stage 2

Stage 3

Stage 4

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT (PIAGET)

Stage 1 - Sensori-motor

Stage 2 - Pre Operational

Stage 3 - Concrete operational

Stage 4 - Formal operations
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

Body:

Brain:

Capacity:

SOCIO-EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Stage 1

Stage 2

Stage 3

Stage 4
## PERSONAL COMPELENCIES CHECKLIST

### 1. LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL MORALE</th>
<th>PREFERRED LEVEL</th>
<th>MINIMUM LEVEL</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Mood</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Attitude</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Motivation</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Self Control</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Empathy</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. INTERACTION SKILLS

- **2.1 Communication**
- **2.2 Listening Interpretation**
- **2.3 Appropriate demonstration of disapproval**
- **2.4 Management style**
- **2.5 Physical Interactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>PREFERRED LEVEL</th>
<th>MINIMUM LEVEL</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE:PROFESSIONAL APPROPRIATE: CONSISTENT</td>
<td>USUALLY POSITIVE PROFESSIONAL APPROPRIATE: CONSISTENT</td>
<td>NEGATIVE:DEROGATORY INAPPROPRIATE: ARBITRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBINSON TRAINING PROGRAMME</td>
<td>JEAN B. JENKIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVELS</td>
<td>PREFERRED LEVEL</td>
<td>MINIMUM LEVEL</td>
<td>UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PERSONAL PRESENTATION</td>
<td>CONSISTENTLY HIGH</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL OPTIMUM</td>
<td>USUALLY GOOD STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Physical comportment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Functional dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Fitness for duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Alertness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Verbal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Physical:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Programmes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Diagnostic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 REFERENTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RULES! RULES! RULES!

Write down three examples of rules which are "Principles of Behaviour" at your workplace, home, club etc.

Write down three examples of rules which are "Procedures for organization" at your workplace, home, club etc.
## Robinson Programme Documentation

### Whole Unit

#### Progressive Behaviour Monitoring Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Performance Monitoring</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integration with</td>
<td>Transfer of programmes</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>Twice weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>generalization</td>
<td>(out of unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partial integration</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>3 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with</td>
<td>training unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(unit consultation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visits programme</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>4 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>training (support)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unit programme</td>
<td>Individual/whole group</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entry (1 month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Stabilization in Unit</th>
<th>Develop Indiv. Programmes</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Supervised/ Self</th>
<th>Twice Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Maintained Whole group</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>3 times daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active resistant</td>
<td>Intensified small group</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>Hourly interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejection/withdrawal</td>
<td>Intensified individual</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>observed or</td>
<td>1/2 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-suspension contract</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>1/4 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-unit suspension</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Close/Buddy</td>
<td>Supervised/</td>
<td>1/4 hourly intervals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Individual Education Programme

- Individual Social Skills Programme
- Individual Interpersonal Skills Programme
- Individual Behaviour Programme

- Skills Acquisition
- Competencies Met
- Documentation

---
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UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN

CRITERIA FOR MOVEMENT BETWEEN STREAMS:

WHAT BEHAVIOURS COULD INDICATE A NEED TO MOVE FROM ENTRY STREAM IN A REGRESSIVE DIRECTION INTO THE BEIGE STREAM?

WHAT BEHAVIOUR COULD INDICATE A NEED TO MOVE FROM ENTRY STREAM IN A PROGRESSIVE DIRECTION INTO THE BLUE STREAM?

WHAT BEHAVIOURS WOULD WARRANT IN-UNIT SUSPENSION?

WHAT BEHAVIOURS WOULD INDICATE READINESS FOR GRADUATION?
UNIT MEETINGS (BASED ON GLASSER)

MAJOR AIMS:

1. To increase involvement between the staff and clients and among clients themselves. (Involvement is an important way to motivate co-operation)

2. To develop in clients, a "success identity" as they contribute to unit meetings and are listened to.

3. To develop clients' confidence and skills in expressing their ideas and opinions.

4. To develop clients' listening skills as they listen to each other.

5. To develop in clients, socially responsible attitudes (e.g. concern for others), and socially responsible behaviours (e.g. respecting the ideas, opinions, and feelings of others).

6. To develop co-operative ways of solving problems which affect individual unit members or the unit as a whole. (This also helps clients feel that they "belong" to the class).

7. To give the opportunity for clients to lead peers, teach peers, discuss with peers in an acceptable way.

8. To provide the opportunity for clients to feedback to staff, concerns and issues in unit procedures.

9. To provide the opportunity for clients to contribute to unit management.
WHAT DO YOU THINK?

THINKS

YOU!!
GET ON WITH
YOUR WORK

WHAT DO YOU
REALLY THINK?

THINKS

THINKS

IT'S NOT
FAIR
YOU CAN'T
MAKE ME
GET LOST! GET*

IS WHAT YOU'RE THINKING
HELPING YOU?

J Wragg
**CUE CARDS MUST BE LEARNT**

**CONSEQUENCES**
- If I lose control/get into trouble, I'll be out of class.
- I could be sent to the deputy/principal.
- Back where I started.
- Letter sent home and Mum/dad feel bad.
- I feel low, angry, etc.
- I could be suspended or expelled.
- No reference, no job.
- No $, holidays, cars.

**CALM THOUGHTS**
- Take it easy.
- Calm down.
- Relax.
- It's not worth it.
- Hang in there.
- Cool it.
- Count to 10.
- Take 4 deep breaths.

**CONTROL AND CONFIDENCE**
- I can do it.
- I can handle it (pressure).
- I'm OK. I'm under control.
- No risk. No worries.
- No problems.
- Etc.

**USE THEM IN BOOKS**

**REHEARSE THEM AT HOME**

J WRAGG
YOU!!
GET ON WITH YOUR WORK

THINK C.....THOUGHTS

THINK C.......
C

OKAY.... NO PROBLEM

J. WRACHT
Table 4. General Overview of Anger Control Training

From Goldstein, A. & Glick, B. (1992) (Aggression Replacement Training)

**Week 1: Introduction**
1. Explain the goals of Anger Control Training and "sell it" to the youngsters.
2. Explain the rules for participating and the training procedures.
3. Give initial assessments of the A-B-Cs of aggressive behavior:
   (A) What led up to it? (B) What did you do? (C) What were the consequences?
4. Review goals, procedures, and A-B-Cs; give out binders.

**Week 2: Cues and Anger Reducers 1, 2, and 3.**
1. Review first session.
2. Introduce the Hassle Log.
3. Discuss how to know when you are angry (cues).
4. Discuss what to do when you know you are angry:
   - Anger reducer 1: deep breathing
   - Anger reducer 2: backward counting
   - Anger reducer 3: pleasant imagery
5. Role play: cues + anger reducers.
6. Review Hassle Log, cues, and anger reducers 1, 2, and 3.

**Week 3: Triggers**
1. Review second session.
2. Discuss understanding what makes you angry (triggers):
   - External triggers
   - Internal triggers
3. Role play: triggers + cues + anger reducer(s).
4. Review triggers, cues, and anger reducers 1, 2, and 3.

**Week 4: Reminders (Anger Reducer 4)**
1. Review third session.
2. Introduce reminders.
3. Model using reminders.
4. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s).
5. Review reminders.

**Week 5: Self-Evaluation**
1. Review fourth session.
2. Introduce self-evaluation:
   - Self-rewarding
   - Self-coaching
3. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + self-evaluation.
Table 4. (cont.)

**Week 6: Thinking Ahead (Anger Reducer 5)**
1. Review fifth session.
2. Introduce thinking ahead.
   - Short- and long-term consequences
   - Most and least serious consequences
   - Internal, external, and social consequences
3. Role play: “if-then” thinking ahead.
4. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + self-evaluation.
5. Review thinking ahead.

**Week 7: The Angry Behavior Cycle**
1. Review sixth session.
2. Introduce the Angry Behavior Cycle.
   - Identifying your own anger-provoking behavior
   - Changing your own anger-provoking behavior
3. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + self-evaluation.
4. Review the Angry Behavior Cycle.

**Week 8: Rehearsal of Full Sequence**
1. Review seventh session.
2. Introduce using new behaviors (skills) in place of aggression.
3. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + SI skill + self-evaluation.

**Week 9: Rehearsal of Full Sequence**
1. Review Hassle Logs.
2. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + SI skill + self-evaluation.

**Week 10: Overall Review**
1. Review Hassle Logs.
2. Recap anger control techniques.
3. Role play: triggers + cues + reminders + anger reducer(s) + SL skill + self-evaluation.
4. Reinforce for participation and encourage to continue.
resolving VIOLENCE

student worksheets
anti-violence curriculum for secondary students
REAL OR FANTASY VIOLENCE?

EXAMPLES OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS

REAL VIOLENCE:
(e.g. Bosnian war victims)
Happened to real
people in the real
world or real
situations

REPRESENTED REALITY:
(e.g. Rambo kills 15 people with a gun)
Performance by
actors made to
look like reality

SIMULATED OR FANTASY:
(e.g. Road Runner drops anvil on coyote)
No real persons
or incidents
involved
DEFINITIONS OF VIOLENCE

Violence is

Violence is not

TYPES OF VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY

How are some of these linked?
CATEGORIES OF VIOLENCE

PREDICT CATEGORIES most likely to be represented in the statistics.
'These acts of violence are most frequent in society.'

1.

2.

3.

ACTUAL INCIDENCE—most frequent categories of violence in Australian society.

1.

2.

3.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION

- per 100 000 pop. in Australia
- per 100 000 pop. in Britain
- per 100 000 pop. in USA
% of offenders are male 17% 10-19 yrs/20% 20-24 yrs
% of offenders are female
% of victims are male
% of victims are female
% of all murders are of children
% of murdered children are murdered by their parents
% of children murdered are under 1 year old
% of murders in NSW occur in Sydney city
% of murders involving a gun
% of murders involving a knife
% of murders involving bashing
INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE (PHYSICAL)

Diagram off OHT 7
INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE (BEHAVIOUR)

EFFECTS OF SUBSTANCES

• Drugs and alcohol can

• Drugs and alcohol DO NOT

• The main indicators of violence are in three categories:

1.

2.

3.

Give examples of each type of indicator
# RELATING TO OTHERS—SELF-RATING SCALE

How do you relate to others? How does your personality style affect the way you deal with conflict? It is likely that you have specific strengths which you can use to cope with difficult situations and people. You may also want to try to improve your ways of relating to others to reduce conflict. Try this questionnaire and discover how you can respond to conflict in a more effective way!

Circle the answer which you think comes closest to a true statement about you, the way you think or behave most of the time.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>At a party you</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>When out with others you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>are the life and soul</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>avoid attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>look after everyone else</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>think up spontaneous activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>enjoy watching others</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>are a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>are a good listener</td>
<td>d)</td>
<td>are happy to go along with their plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 | **Emotionally you** | 6 | **Your feelings are** |
| a) | are very controlled | a) | intense and visible |
| b) | don’t like to show how you feel | b) | never out of control |
| c) | are very quiet | c) | kept to yourself |
| d) | are very excitable | d) | often hurt |

| 3 | **When working with others you** | 7 | **In a team you** |
| a) | cope well with pressure | a) | take charge and direct others |
| b) | remember important details | b) | avoid conflict |
| c) | have creative ideas | c) | insist on high standards |
| d) | help them to achieve | d) | inspire others |

<p>| 4 | <strong>As a friend you</strong> | 8 | <strong>You think that friends</strong> |
| a) | are sometimes unforgiving | a) | sometimes expect too much of you |
| b) | want attention | b) | cannot always be trusted |
| c) | dominate | c) | should always be there for you |
| d) | stay uninvolved | d) | should not be shared |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At a social event you often</th>
<th></th>
<th>Work projects you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a) can’t get enthusiastic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>a) think the work is more interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) feel insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td>than the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) need to be the centre of attention</td>
<td>b) can’t decide where to start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) probably organised it</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) boss others about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Your mood is often</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) would rather others took charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>bright on the surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) envy your bubbly personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>argumentative</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) know they can depend on you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) know you are concerned about them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When a job has to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) know you are faithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>would rather talk</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>hate the thought of making a mistake</td>
<td>a) go completely overboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>can’t get motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) can’t relax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>would rather plan than start</td>
<td>c) don’t get too excited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When a friend is in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) go home early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>will guide and advise them</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Your greatest emotional strength is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>will listen to their problems but not offer advice</td>
<td>a) your confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>will cry along with them</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) your calmness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>will think of something to cheer them up</td>
<td>c) your sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In a social group you</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) your enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>thrive on arguments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Work to you is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>are usually shy and quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) too much effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>think they are talking about you</td>
<td>b) very stressful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>won’t let anybody else get a word in</td>
<td>c) hard to manage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>You show how you feel by being</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) your greatest interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>easy-going and relaxed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A friend should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>deep and serious</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) faithful and devoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>enthusiastic and expressive</td>
<td>b) someone who shares your excitement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>confident and active</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) willing to follow you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) pleasant and easy-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUMORIST: You are a playful, sociable, enthusiastic and exciting person to be with. Your energy is always high—you can play and work hard and usually do both while talking non-stop! You are creative and full of ideas and can use humour in many situations. Because of your verbal skills and energy, you may attempt in a conflict situation to talk to the other person using humour and positive statements to convince them you are not enemies. You need to consider the impact your high energy and communication levels have on others—you probably don’t give them a chance to show their humorous side or to hold the floor for very long. Take a tip and try to spend some time actively listening to others—it can only improve your popularity!

PERSUADER: You are a born leader, a dynamic and strong person. Your goal-directed approach to life will guarantee your success. You are independent and your confidence is a great asset. Because of your leadership ability and strength of personality, you could try in a conflict situation, to assume control and persuade the other person to trust you. You will use a positive manner and assertiveness to come up with a practical solution to any problem. Your driving need to be always right, however, can be the source of conflict and you may need to take time to consider the opinions and contributions of others.

SYMPATHISER: You are an easy-going and relaxed person who makes others feel calm and safe. You will avoid conflict at any cost. You are a good listener—a decided asset in any conflict situation! Your sympathetic side is also a useful tool to use when disputes arise. Your peaceful nature encourages others to seek reasonable solutions to any problem. The approach you are most likely to use is to listen, and to offer sympathy and reassurance while your cool personality assists in calming the troubled waters. You must be careful, however that your laid-back approach to life is not interpreted as a lack of care—sometimes you do need to pay attention to the complaints and concerns of your colleagues and friends.

ANALYSER: You are a well-organised, sensitive and thoughtful person. Your strengths lie in your self-control and ability to be analytical in conflict situations. Your respectful, deep and thorough manner of discussing problems can be used to convince the other person that you really are both on the same side and that you are willing to consider their views. Your self-control may be interpreted by some as coldness and your unemotional methods of dealing with sometimes highly emotional situations may backfire if there is an emotional relationship involved. Don’t be afraid to demonstrate some passion and commitment if the issue is particularly important to you!
SO, HOW DO YOU RELATE TO OTHERS?

To mark your score and find out your preferred response style, follow this guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Circle the letter which matches your answer for each item 1-20.
- Total the columns H, P, S, A—add together the number of answers in each column and record at the base of the column in TOTAL box.
- Now record the total for each letter (H, 1-10 + H, 11-20) (P, 1-10 + P, 11-20) etc.

- H Total (HUMORIST)
- P Total (PERSUADER)
- S Total (SYMPATHISER)
- A Total (ANALYSER)

The letter with the highest score indicates the key personal response style you are likely to choose.
SELF-VIEWING SURVEY

Record incidents of violence you view on TV or video over the next few days, for discussion at the next session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCIDENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM(S):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFENDER(S):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCIDENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM(S):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFENDER(S):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Gender Differences in Violence

## Types of Incidents of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Incidents</th>
<th>Fictional Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressors</td>
<td>Aggressors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Worksheet 8**

**Module 4**
**SURVEY OF FRIENDS’ VIEWING CHOICES**

*NB:* Following each interview ask each person this question: ‘Do you think that watching violent TV/Movies can make people become violent?’ and record briefly the response.

**FEMALES**

1.  
2.  
3.  

**AGE**

**CHOICES**

**REASONS**

**CAUSES VIOLENCE?**

**MALES**

1.  
2.  
3.  

**AGE**

**CHOICES**

**REASONS**

**CAUSES VIOLENCE?**
ORIGINS OF VIOLENCE

INTERNAL FACTORS
(these start within the person and may lead to violence):

EMOTIONS

ATTITUDES

EXTERNAL FACTORS
(these happen outside, or to, the person and may lead to violent choices):

ALTERNATIVE BEHAVIOURAL CHOICES
RECORDING A - B - C

INCIDENT OBSERVED:

1. Antecedent (what happened immediately before the incident?)

2. Behaviours (what exactly did you see happen?)

3. Consequences (what happened immediately after the incident?)
# Preventing Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Observed</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Incident In Which I Was Involved:

- antecedent

- behaviour chosen

- consequences
RESPONDING TO VIOLENCE

KEY RESPONSES AND EXAMPLES

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.
VIOLENCE IN RELATIONSHIPS

TV/VIDEO OBSERVATIONS

DATE: ____________ TIME: ____________

PROGRAM: ____________

RELATIONSHIP: ____________

INCIDENT: ____________

DATE: ____________ TIME: ____________

PROGRAM: ____________

RELATIONSHIP: ____________

INCIDENT: ____________

DATE: ____________ TIME: ____________

PROGRAM: ____________

RELATIONSHIP: ____________

INCIDENT: ____________

Module 7
TYPES OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

1. TYPES OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:

2. TYPES OF VIOLENCE LINKED WITH INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:

3. TYPES OF PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS:

4. TYPES OF VIOLENCE LINKED WITH PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS:
NON-VIOLENT RESPONSES TO CONFLICT

RECORD INCIDENT(S)

1.

2.

3.
SEEKING HELP TO AVOID VIOLENCE

Examples
1. 
2. 
3. 

Phone No:
Organisation:
Procedure:

Who can access?

CONTACTING A HELP-LINE—COMPLETE FOR HOMEWORK MODULE 9

Phone No:
Organisation:
Procedure/Help available:

Who can access?

N.B. Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of your call is to find out information about help agencies.
ASSERTIVENESS

WHAT IS ASSERTIVENESS?

GOALS OF ASSERTIVENESS

ASSERTIVENESS CONTINUUM
FEEDBACK ON ASSERTIVENESS
ROLE PLAYS

SITUATION

1. VERBAL CONTENT:
   • WORDS CHOSEN
   • TONE OF VOICE (hostile/calm)
   • PITCH OF VOICE (loud/soft)
   • MESSAGE GIVEN
     were any of these used?
   • BLAMING
   • ABUSE
   • COMPLAINING

2. NON-VERBAL CONTENT
   • EYE CONTACT
   • PHYSICAL CONTACT
   • DISTANCE
   • GESTURES
   • CONFIDENCE SHOWN
   • PHYSICAL POSTURE

3. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
As a result of this program:

I will refuse to use violence to settle problems

I will show others how to avoid violence

I will talk to others about how to avoid violence

I will notify someone in authority if I see or know of violence happening

I will be more aware of how to protect myself and others

I will let others know that their violent behaviour is not acceptable

I will reject violence towards women

I will reject violence towards men

I will reject violence towards children

I will reject violence towards people of other nationalities, or backgrounds
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

IMPACT OF PROGRAM

I learned new information

I found out:

- about relating to others without violence
- statistical information on violence
- about the effects of real violence
- how to notice indicators of violence
- how I relate to others in conflict situations
- how my personality can help me deal with conflict
- that males and females have a different experience of violence
- ways to seek help in violent situations
- how to be more assertive
- about different types of violence in different relationships

KEY:
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
N = NOT SURE
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
I really enjoyed:
- role plays
- discussion
- worksheets
- working with my own gender group
  (girls, or boys only)
- working in mixed groups
I was able to express my views
I learned through making posters

The program should be part of the curriculum.
The program would be better if

COMMENTS:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!
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Violence in modern society is substantial and growing. At all age levels, and in diverse venues, the perpetration of aggressive behaviour intensifies—assault, rape, homicide, and more. Many of our homes have become more like battlefields than sanctuaries, as husbands and wives, or parents and children go at each other. Our streets, public and private transit, and our community institutions are less safe. Even our schools, where we send our future to learn and develop, have become the locus for bullying, harassment, fights, or worse.

A portion of our society's response to this growing threat to our individual and collective welfare has been constructive, even enlightened. But much of our manner of seeking to deal with the violence in our midst makes matters worse. Some of us become very fearful, fearful way out of proportion to the actuarial likelihood of becoming a victim of violence. Such fear is handled by some building a personal fortress of locks, alarms and other devices to hide behind. Others throw up their arms, feel helpless and overwhelmed, perhaps sentencing themselves to solitary confinement every night for fear of going out.

Yet others respond to what they see and read with denial or desensitisation. To them, the situation is not as bad as the media say or, if it is, why should I care?

We can do better. We need not distort the facts, the realities of contemporary violence, by either making them seem worse than they are, or by inappropriately minimising what is real. What is needed is a serious and substantial educational effort, perhaps targeted especially to that high violence age, adolescence. Ideally, it will be an effort that accurately, comprehensively, and interestingly teaches all about violence in its many forms, as well as effective means for its prevention and resolution. The
Resolving Violence curriculum does all of this, and more, in a manner likely to be especially appealing to the hard-to-reach, action-oriented adolescent of today.

We live in a world that far too often and far too well teaches our youths that violence pays. It is, indeed, difficult at times to be optimistic about the likely success of our prevention and intervention efforts. Yet we need not be pessimistic. Let us, instead, be realistic. Approaches do exist that can make a difference. Perhaps not with all youths, nor even in some places with most youths, but certainly with many. Resolving Violence, most assuredly, is one such approach, and an especially promising one. I am most pleased to encourage its widespread use and dissemination.

Arnold P. Goldstein, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Research on Aggression
Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
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Introduction

The Case for an Anti-Violence Curriculum for Young People

The Australian statistical information contained in this package and the frighteningly real statistics known from overseas studies indicate quite clearly that young people (10-19 years old) are at greatest risk of a violent death in modern society and that they are most at risk from each other. Further, young men are almost twice as likely as young women to meet a violent end, and are implicated in 90 per cent of violent incidents in this age group. Clearly, an intervention devised to bring this information to their conscious attention is needed. This curriculum has been devised to provide awareness and information about violence in our society. It is about defining violence for young people by helping them to differentiate real from fantasy violence, in an effort to combat the impact of media images which suggest that violence is not real, not harmful, not permanent.

This is an anti-violence curriculum in that it gives messages about rejecting violence as an option, and adopting appropriate non-violent responses to conflict in everyday interactions. It cannot claim to be a violence prevention package. Many of the young people to whom the curriculum will be presented have not generally been, and never will be, violent people. Some may complete the course of study and yet still engage at some later date in violent acts within their relationships. Unless baseline measures of violence are taken before the application of the program, and comparative data taken at the completion, we will never know if the content has had the effect of preventing participants from engaging in further violence. However, the curriculum does attempt to measure and effect attitudes towards violence with an anticipated shift towards a view which rejects violence in our society.
Education has become a much more complex endeavour in recent years, with teachers being given greater responsibility for imparting specialised knowledge and developing technical skills to ensure the employability of future generations. It is apparent now that such knowledge and skills will only partially equip these young people for life. It is essential that they are assisted in developing survival and coping skills and in acquiring appropriate interpersonal skills if they are to have a successful future. Such skills need to be incorporated into the formal teaching arena and given a level of importance corresponding to their impact. The violence statistics clearly indicate that systematic attention needs to be paid to the development of appropriate interpersonal skills, to broadening the repertoire of response behaviours young people can draw upon and to encouraging positive attitudes. This cannot be left to chance.

Further, it is clear that the many influences on young people to accept violence and to endorse its use need to be challenged. This curriculum equips adolescents with factual information and an opportunity to discuss and reject commonly held beliefs and attitudes about the role of violence in our society. They are challenged to examine their own beliefs and attitudes in the light of information they may not have previously known. There is a deliberate attempt in the curriculum to acknowledge the different experiences of violence of each gender, and to offer support and direction in the acquisition of response strategies for each group. Successive generations need to work towards a rejection of violence in its many forms, and towards establishing equal status to all members of society, in order that they can live, interact, learn and work in a positive and safe environment.

Australia currently has the world's highest suicide rate amongst young people. This in itself is a staggering piece of information. It indicates a need for vigilance and a commitment on the part of professionals, and others involved with young people, to intervene in behaviours which suggest a troubled view of the world. This curriculum, by addressing specific issues in each module and by requiring an interactive presentation style, places the presenter in a position of close proximity to the young people involved. It encourages free expression of viewpoints and offers guidance for those students expressing views which reflect a violent orientation.

The curriculum differs from others in that it also recognises gender differences in the experiences of violence. It is not enough to discuss the presence of violence in our society—analysis of such violence indicates clearly that it is most often perpetrated by males. Female participants will benefit from segregated sessions which attempt to empower them in help-
seeking and assertiveness, while male participants need clarification of the legal implications for violent behaviours and reinforcement and encouragement that their own non-violent stance is necessary and applauded. This is coupled with an attempt to develop interpersonal and communication skills for both sexes throughout the program.

Recent research indicates that female students are victims of sexual harassment, date rape and other violent assaults while at school (Hamner & Maynard, 1987) and that power is a key factor in the victimisation of females in school settings (Robinson, 1996). The curriculum attempts to locate the locus of control for survival of violence firmly within the capabilities of young women, and to encourage attribution of survival to their own abilities and efforts.

Young men gain from this curriculum an insight into, and empathy for, the victims of violence and the results of violent interactions. They are introduced to concepts of assertiveness which suggest that strength and masculinity are not compatible with violence towards others, particularly women and children. There is no subtle way of getting this message across. The cognitive patterns which violent males use to explain their actions must be restructured. By discussing these issues with non-violent males, it is anticipated that their more violent associates will be positively influenced.

One further area of concern is addressed in this curriculum. The impact of 'violent' media images on the behaviour of recipients needs exploration and discussion. However, the view commonly expressed, that watching violent videos makes people violent is not the view presented in this curriculum. The evidence is overwhelming that the majority of people who watch violence do not become violent or engage, generally, in violent behaviour. It is this very point that is discussed with program participants. The fact that they have watched violence at some point, and have made a decision that to engage in such behaviour would be morally and socially wrong, and that the control they demonstrate by making this choice is a sign of their social maturity, is a much more positive and realistic observation than to suggest to them that they should never watch violence. This is not a popular viewpoint, but one which addresses the issue at the most fundamental level. Participants are asked to engage in some introspection regarding their own violence viewing, and to acknowledge their own level of control.

The curriculum is a generic anti-violence program, suitable for presentation to a wide range of clients across a range of social institutions. It attempts to change attitudes through education and to change behaviours through practice.
I thank all those who subscribe to these aspirations and who intend to use this curriculum to develop an anti-violence culture.

It is a first step on a long road towards a more deliberate attempt to intervene in violence—not as it occurs in reality but as it is formulated in thought and reinforced through attitudes.

We have a long journey ahead.

Thank you for deciding to join in.

Jean B. Jenkin
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How to implement this curriculum

This curriculum will best serve its purpose as an anti-violence information package when it is incorporated into the participating organisation as part of a comprehensive approach to managing and preventing violence. Such a comprehensive approach comprises three main components:

a. Policy or legislation which promote non-violence within the organisation;
b. Training and preparation of personnel towards a rejection of violence; and
c. Anti-violence curricula which inform the general group and offer alternative ways of thinking for identified or potentially violent persons.

More details of this approach are available from the author (Jenkin 1995).

Trials of this curriculum have been successful in a range of social organisations including schools, youth detention and adult correctional facilities, all of which report shifts in expressed pro-violent attitudes towards a less accepting viewpoint following the program.

Implementation strategies

This curriculum can be offered in educational settings other than schools. However, for the sake of example, we will refer here to a school-based presentation mode.

The content fits into educational curricula including Health, Personal Development, Physical Education, English, Social Studies, Science or Maths.
1. **Multi-disciplinary approach**

This approach can be used if the curriculum is to be taught across an integrated program in a secondary school setting. Teachers from a range of disciplines can select the module which most closely reflects the content or orientation of their subject, and teach that module as part of the term program. This demonstrates that the issues of violence are a multi- and inter-disciplinary concern. If this approach is used it is preferable for one staff member to take responsibility for coordination and monitoring. The following is a suggested combination of module with subjects:

**Module 1**  Violence in Society—Perceptions including Attitude Scale—introduction by coordinating staff member

**Module 2**  Violence in Society—Statistics—Maths or Social Studies

**Module 3**  Predicting Violence and Relating to Others Scale—Science or English

**Module 4**  Violence and Gender—English or PD/Health/PE

**Module 5**  Origins of Violence—Social Studies

**Module 6**  Preventing Violence—PD/Health/PE

**Module 7**  Responding to Violence—Science

**Module 8**  Violence in Relationships—English or Arts faculty

**Module 9**  Seeking Help to Avoid Violence—Social Studies

**Module 10**  Effective Communication in Violent Situations—English

With this approach, a whole school commitment is evident and the issues are discussed in the realistic context of a range of subject and presenter emphases. In practical terms it means that staff need to familiarise themselves with the modules to determine which offer the most relevant activities and content, then a decision can be taken as to the number of class sessions to be devoted to the program for each subject. This methodology also means that students may be working across modules and may have content from more than one module in a week. A sample timetable follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD. 1</td>
<td>MOD. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week 2</td>
<td>MOD. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD. 3</td>
<td>MOD. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD. 4</td>
<td>MOD. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week 4</td>
<td>MOD. 4</td>
<td>MOD. 6</td>
<td>MOD. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week 5</td>
<td>MOD. 7</td>
<td>MOD. 8</td>
<td>MOD. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week 6</td>
<td>MOD. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD. 10</td>
<td>MOD. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Single subject approach

The content of the curriculum can be selected as a term program for a single subject area. There are ten modules and this would probably represent ten weeks programming rather than ten lessons, as each module is quite comprehensive in terms of content and activities. This approach permits continuity and an intensity of treatment as well as the opportunity to frequently revisit previous content and establish links. It can be either an advantage or a disadvantage for the content to be confined within one subject area, but this approach may be the first option with a more widely applied approach taken following whole school endorsement, and successful application. Suggested subject areas include those previously listed, if the curriculum content is seen as a substitute for other content. However, the more integrated the content within the learning experiences prepared for students, the more realistic and relevant the information will seem. Teachers as creative programmers may well incorporate this work with their regular content. Otherwise, the modules can be presented as a complete program running over a term with the homework and other activities providing the complete content for the unit of study.

3. Gender segregation

The curriculum is designed to be presented to gender-segregated groups for some modules. The question of exclusion or gender-based discrimination is not an issue in this arrangement as each group is presented with the same
material. However, the absence of the other sex seems to have a dis-inhibiting effect when the groups are separated for discussion. Further, the overwhelming bias evident in the violence statistics which indicate that males are the most likely and frequent perpetrators and victims indicates that it is crucial for male and female participants to be given the opportunity to discuss this information and their concerns while in separate groups, as well as together. Experience has shown that where this methodology is employed, students appreciate the opportunity for frank discussion and open debate with same sex peers, and that this in some ways prepares and gives them confidence for the mixed sessions. It is a major focus of this program that the difficult gender issues be explored and fully discussed to facilitate the process of collaboration against violent behaviour and attitudes, and the segregated sessions provide reflection time for this to occur.

4. Implementation steps

Step 1 Preparation

Secure the agreement of staff, school council and parents to implement the curriculum at the school (or relevant personnel if at other locations) prior to discussing the content or concept with prospective participants, such as students. It is useful to have some idea of the implementation process you feel would best suit the setting and to prepare a paper, presentation or verbal explanation which will inform colleagues.

Step 2 Implementation

Read out introductory comments to establish the parameters and orientation of the curriculum. It is more likely to be experienced by students as a positive and extending experience if the presenter has a reasonably clear personal view of the issues and is prepared to listen to students and to discuss issues in the context of the curriculum. The content is not of a specialised nature and the experience of the curriculum should assist participants to examine new concepts as well as their own strongly held views. It is a long process of gradual reflection over some weeks which will result in changed opinions, particularly if they are challenged rather than rejected.
Step 3 Program Summary

This section provides an overview of module content and is useful as a quick revision guide either during new sessions or before beginning the next module. It particularly provides a summary of homework and worksheets to be used during sessions. Each summary can be photocopied onto a card and kept handy during the session for reference.

Step 4 Preparation and Resources

This summary is used during the preparation of each session and can be a practical record of the segments which have been completed. Some modules will require more than one session for completion and this summary can be used to refresh preparation prior to the following session.

Both of these summaries are included to be used as organisational tools so that the full notes for the content may not be necessary during presentation. Fundamentally, if the presenter is familiar with the content and activities, these brief notes will suffice for the presentation.

Step 5 Guidelines for Presenters

Detailed notes which guide the presenter in the orientation and content of the program are provided following the module outlines. The notes explain the purpose and goals of the module as well as suggesting activity and discussion topics, and are written to provide clarification of the anti-violence message as it relates to each module. Presenters are given enough detail to prepare for the session, and to conduct group discussions.

However, as the modules often require open debate of issues all possible responses cannot be anticipated. In the event of participants expressing opinions, or displaying behaviours which do not support the anti-violence thrust (such as young people stating their preference for fighting, or making racist or sexist remarks) the presenter must be prepared to address the inappropriate comments and actions and to use these as examples to illustrate alternative views. It can be helpful to draw on the other participants to reinforce the anti-violence message. This is an effective measure, and an excellent training mechanism for the ‘real life’ confrontations we can expect participants will encounter after completion of the curriculum. By way of an example, one young man during the trial of this curriculum was expressing the view that date rape was quite an
attractive idea. He did not make this comment in an overt way but was
giggling about the prospect to a nearby friend. Having been effectively
introduced to the anti-violence message, his surrounding peers challenged
his ‘joke’, refused to accept his assertion that he was ‘kidding’ and asked him
how he would feel if he were attacked in similar circumstances. Obviously,
these diversions take time out of the lesson as planned, but are crucial to
the impact and outcomes of the curriculum. It is hoped that during their
social and personal experiences outside school, these young people will offer
similarly strong and well-informed challenges to people whose views seem
to support violence.

Each module includes information about the content, activities,
overheads and homework relevant to the topic, and worksheets are
important as a reference.

**Step 6 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The worksheets provide a clear indication of whether a particular student is
retaining and comprehending the content. The presenter who follows the
responses closely will be able to identify students whose attitudes and
behaviour, as well as written comments, indicate a need for further
intervention. This student should be monitored and interviewed by a
qualified school counsellor who may recommend alternative intervention.
In the appendix there is an evaluation form which indicates concept
acquisition and which may be used to determine revision or extension
of the program.
Program summary

The following summary indicates the content, activities, worksheets and homework tasks for each module.

Preliminary activity

Administer and score *Attitudes Towards Violence Questionnaire*.

Module summaries

**Module 1 — Perceptions (Joint)**

*Content* — Students will acquire knowledge related to the reality or fantasy of violence viewed on videos or television; they will define violence and identify the different types of violence in society.

*Activities* — Small group and whole group discussion.

*Worksheets*

1. Record examples of real, representational and fantasy violence.
2. Record definitions and types of violence.

*Homework* — Collect examples from newspapers, magazines, photos etc., of violence in our society.

**Module 2 — Statistics (Joint)**

*Content* — Students will use collected samples of violence in society to identify various categories of violence, e.g. gender bases (male ->
female; male -> male; female -> female, etc.); age bases (children ->
adolescents -> adults); sexual violence; child abuse; domestic violence
and incidents of violence which involve the wider community, such as
war and civil unrest.

Students will acquire knowledge in relation to the dynamics of violence
in our society; discuss statistics.

Activities — In small groups, students design a collage for display related to
the categories recorded.

Worksheets

3. Record categories of violence and record statistical information.

Homework — Collect further examples of violence in society.

Module 3 — Predicting violence (Joint)

Content — Students will become familiar with the emotional, physiological
and behavioural indicators of violence; they will examine their own style
of interpersonal interaction using the ‘Relating to Others’ scale.

Activities — Whole group brainstorm and discussion—individual work.

Worksheets

4. Record indicators of violence;
5. Effects of substances;

Homework — Complete worksheet activity 7—’self-viewing survey’.

Module 4 — Violence and gender

(Segregated)

Content — Students will differentiate perpetrators and victims following
analysis of survey sheet. They will also discuss their own experiences of
violence as a perpetrator, victim and observer; clarify criminal and legal
terms and meanings related to violence.

Activities — Students will develop a poster identifying gender differences in
the experience of violence.

Worksheets

8. Record gender differences in violence (victims, aggressors).

Homework — Complete worksheet activity 9—survey (friends’ viewing
choices).
Module 5 — Origins of violence
(Segregated)

Content — Students will identify interpersonal and environmental factors impacting on violence (emotions, racial and sexual prejudice, unemployment) and discuss the role of ‘choice’ in violent incidents.
Activities — Students will role-play vignettes and be video-taped for feedback.
Worksheets

Homework
11. Distribute—Recording A-B-C. Students will be required to observe or recall incidents of violence and analyse these using the antecedent-behaviour-consequence procedure.

Module 6 — Preventing violence
(Segregated)

Content—Students will identify antecedents to violence, violent behaviours and the consequence of violence; they will review the impact of personal ‘style’ on violent behaviours.
Activities — Review video footage; re-enact vignettes with different outcomes.
Worksheets

Module 7 — Responding to violence
(Segregated)

Content — Students will identify a range of responses possible in a violent incident and will decide the appropriateness of the responses to specific incidents. Responses discussed include fight, flight, negotiation, help-seeking and reporting.
Activities — Role plays. Discussion.
Worksheets
13. Responding to violence.

Homework
14. Violence in relationships—observations of TV or video images.
Module 8 — Violence in relationships (Joint)

Content — Review segregated sessions. Students will discuss the types of violence sometimes present in intimate relationships between parents, partners, children, young adults (including date rape, rape in marriage, child physical and sexual abuse, domestic violence, etc.), and in professional relationships (teacher, doctor, club leader, sports coach, police, etc.).

Activities — Hypothetical—Students will enact a hypothetical situation dealing with several types of relationship violence. Discussion.

Worksheets
15. Record types of relationships and possibilities for violence.

Homework
16. Non-violent responses to conflict—students will observe and analyse conflict situations in which a non-violent solution was successfully used.

Module 9 — Seeking help to avoid violence (Joint)

Content — Students are asked to identify services in the community which can be accessed for assistance in the event of a violent incident. Many examples are presented and a directory of ‘help’ agencies composed.

Activities — Research, group discussion, role plays.

Worksheets
17. Seeking Help (top section completed in class, lower section completed for homework).

Module 10 — Effective communication (Joint)

Content — This module examines verbal and non-verbal communication and the skills of assertiveness in potential conflict situations. Students engage in fun activities requiring restrictions to communication, and also role-play assertiveness in real-life scenarios, providing each other with feedback.

Activities — Role plays, group discussion.

Worksheets
17. Review homework (lower section—phone call to help agency).
18. What is assertiveness?
19. Assertiveness feedback.

The module content is now complete and the program should be terminated with the application of the following:
   • Attitude Survey (Repeat).
## Preparation and Resources for Individual Modules

### Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Read attitude survey and scoring procedure.
- Read notes re: real and fantasy violence, definitions and types of violence.
- Advise students to bring paste/scissors next session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong> to <strong>O6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Read statistical information provided and familiarise self with overheads.
- Provide butchers paper, paste and scissors in case students forget to supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong> to <strong>O8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W4</strong> to <strong>W7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Read notes re: physiological, emotional indicators of violence.
- Read notes re: relating to others/personality type.
- Complete interaction style questionnaire for self: 'Relating to Others.'
- Copy 'Relating to Others' scale and worksheet 7 for distribution; also copies of OHT 7 (body diagram) for students.

### Resources

| **Attitude Survey** |
| **Worksheet 1** |
| **Worksheet 2** |

| OHT sheets 2,3,4,5,6 |
| Definitions OHT 1 |
| Worksheet 3 |
| Butchers paper |

| OHT 6,7,8 |
| have OHT 1-5 on hand |
| Worksheet 4/5/6 |
| Distribute Worksheet 7 |

**OHT 7**
Module 4  segregated

- Review worksheet 7.
- Read notes re: gender differences in violence perpetration and victimisation.
- Copy worksheet 9 for distribution.
- PRESENT THIS MODULE SEPARATELY FOR MALES/FEMALES

5 sheets cardboard
Worksheet 8
Distribute Worksheet 9
OHT 1 and 16

Module 5  segregated

- Review worksheet 9. Video recorder
- Read notes re: issues and research in violence viewing. Worksheet 10
- Read notes re: interpersonal factors. Vignettes Distribute Worksheet 11
- Access room space for role plays.
- Copy worksheets and vignettes (cut into separate strips for small groups).
- PRESENT THIS MODULE SEPARATELY FOR MALES/FEMALES

Module 6  segregated

- Review worksheet 11. Video player and Video from week 5
- Read notes re: A-B-C of behaviour. Worksheet 12
- Copy worksheet 12.
- PRESENT THIS MODULE SEPARATELY FOR MALES/FEMALES

Module 7  segregated

- Be prepared to explain the 5 key responses. Worksheet 13
- Copy worksheet 14.
- PRESENT THIS MODULE SEPARATELY FOR MALES/FEMALES

Distribute Worksheet 14

Module 8

- Review worksheet 14. OHT 1 to 6 for review
- Read background fact sheets on relationship violence.
- Read hypothetical script.
- Prepare worksheet 16.

Worksheet 15
Distribute Worksheet 16

Module 9

- Review worksheet 16. Worksheet 17
- Read notes re help seeking.
- Copy worksheet 17.

Telephone directories
(community, local, state)

Module 10

- Read notes re: communication. Worksheets 17-19
- Copy evaluation form.
- Copy attitude survey.

OHT 9-15
Evaluation form
Worksheet 20
Attitude Survey (repeat)
Preliminary activity

'Attitudes towards Violence' survey

Before attempting any of the modules, the following attitude survey should be administered. The survey permits pre-testing of attitude towards violence which can then be repeated following the curriculum—and should clearly show a shift towards a more positive attitude.

About the questionnaire

The questionnaire is designed with twenty items in four categories. Each item is worded to express a negative attitude: i.e. a violent person or a person who was ill-informed about violence would agree with the statements. For example:

It is OK to hit children to make them behave

To agree or strongly agree with this statement reflects a potentially more violent attitude and would contribute to a high score. Students should not be given any information about this until the curriculum has been completed. They may then be able to understand why each of the items is not 'correct' or acceptable. To provide the information prior to administering the survey would contaminate the results as students are then likely to select socially acceptable responses, and not the responses which reflect their genuine views.

The curriculum is designed to deliver information and therefore is expected to contribute to improved attitudes. Students who receive a high score on the initial administration should be encouraged and supported to achieve a lower score on the second administration.
Administering the survey — Before curriculum

1. Prior to beginning the modules and before any discussion of violence—preferably a day to a week beforehand—distribute the questionnaire to each student. Have a set of sticky labels prepared with numbers already written on them.

2. Students then randomly select a number 0-40 (or the number of students in the class, e.g. 0-32) and use this as their Student Identification (SID). Students should keep a record of their number—it is useful to provide the number on a sticky label which can be attached to their workfolder. Students record SID on top of the survey sheet.


4. Explain the meaning of column labels:
   - **SA** — strongly agree
   - **A** — agree
   - **N** — not sure
   - **D** — disagree
   - **SD** — strongly disagree

   Do not inform students of score values.

5. Students complete survey.

6. Student scores are calculated by the teacher on the basis of the category values (see below). This can be done prior to the first module session and students can be given the results just before commencing the program.

7. At the first session present OHT ("RESULTS") which discusses the relationship of the score to the attitude. Encourage discussion of items and indicate that the curriculum will cover all the issues raised in the items.

8. Collect the surveys—they are anonymous because you do not know who has which number. Retain until end of curriculum.

Administering the survey — After the curriculum

1. Distribute survey—direct students to record SID (refer to sticky label in workbook if they do not remember it).

2. Review column labels (SA, A, N, D, SD).

3. Do not refer to score values.
4. Students complete the survey.
5. Explain score values ($SA = 5; A = 4; N = 3; D = 2; SD = 1$) and direct students to total columns and record overall total.
6. Distribute first copy of survey by passing around the bundle—students locate SID (Student Identification).
7. Students can be asked to comment on their scores—which should reflect a shift lower for those with originally negative attitudes (high scores). Encourage discussion.
8. Collect surveys for analysis. It is not advisable for students to retain the surveys as misuse can occur.
9. The same procedures can be followed for other participants in the curriculum.
10. The survey should only be administered by those people who have professional qualifications (teacher, counsellor, psychologist, etc.) and in conjunction with the delivery of the curriculum. Results may not be meaningful if used in isolation.

Score values:

\[
\begin{align*}
SA &= 5 \\
A &= 4 \\
N &= 3 \\
D &= 2 \\
SD &= 1
\end{align*}
\]
### Attitudes towards violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SID</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is OK to hit children to make them behave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When a man slaps a woman that is not violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would use violence in some circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anger causes people to be violent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You should stick up for yourself by fighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fighting between children is not really violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have used violence in the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asian people cause Australians to become violent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers in school sometimes need to use physical force to keep order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fighting and punching on the sports field is not really violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I will smack my children to discipline them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Homosexuals cause straight guys to become violent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sometimes a man needs to slap his wife to stop her nagging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rape is not always a violent act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I believe in using physical punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Watching violent movies is exciting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If more children were regularly smacked their behaviour would improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hitting children with a cane at school is not being violent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I find that hitting another person helps me get rid of my anger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Getting drunk makes people violent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLUMN TOTALS**

**OVERALL TOTAL**

---

Resolving Violence
Attitudes towards violence survey

Results—Interpretation

Score of 80–100

This is a high negative score
Your score indicates that you believe that physical punishment has a place in our society. Your score also seems to suggest that you believe aggression or violence is a solution to conflict and that people have a right to hurt others. This indicates a need for you to gain more information and to reconsider your views. It may help if you think about how you feel if others are physically aggressive towards you—it is unlikely that you would want to cooperate with such a person. You are quite accepting of a range of violent acts and may even encourage others to act this way. Please seek further information to assist you in developing a less aggressive view of relationships.

Score of 60–79

This is a moderately negative score
You have quite a negative view of the place of violence in our society. You think that some people can and should use violence, and that problems can be solved in this way. Your score is quite high and indicates that you need to look for more information and work towards a more positive attitude. You are likely to agree that using physically aggressive means to get what you want is an acceptable way to relate to others. Please consider the effects of such actions on another person—they are not likely to want to continue to be involved in any relationship with you if your preferred means of communicating is to use force. Please continue to seek information about the effects of violence to improve your attitude.
Score of 40–59

This is a low negative score
You are unsure about whether it is acceptable for people to be violent in some circumstances. You are aware that using physical force against another person to get them to agree with or comply with your views is unacceptable, but you possibly feel that using physical ‘discipline’ is sometimes OK. Generally, however, you prefer non-violent means of conflict resolution and your score indicates that you have developed a reasonably non-violent view of relationships. Keep working on a more positive attitude. It may help for you to put yourself in the shoes of the other person and decide if violence is ever the right response.

Score of 20–39

You have a very positive attitude and are well informed about the place and impact of violence in our society. Your low score indicates that you are aware that conflict can be solved using means other than violence—please keep up this positive attitude! Your influence is needed to convince others that violence is not the best way to deal with problems.
Module 1 (Joint)

Violence in society - perceptions

N.B. Have you completed attitude survey?

Outcomes

Students will:

- Discuss incidents of violence viewed on video and TV.
- Define violence.
- Differentiate between fantasy and 'real' violence.
- Identify broad categories and types of violence.

Focus

The information students receive from this introductory session relates to the presence of violence in society, its real and fantasy representation and the way in which violence can be defined. The focus is on clarifying types of violence, and the impact of violence, in daily life.

Student activities

During this module students will:

1. Discuss video and TV violence.
2. Engage in small group discussions.
3. Develop a personal definition of violence.
4. Complete worksheets activities 1 and 2.
Procedure

Step 1. Brainstorm violence viewed on video and TV, e.g. news, movies, cartoons. Record on whiteboard.

- Students using worksheet 1, find and record examples of violence from whiteboard and place in the appropriate category on the worksheet.

Step 2. Divide group into small groups (gender balanced) to discuss and record whether the violent incidents were real, represented reality or were fantasy.

- Whole group discussion and input from teacher re simulated/real violence and impact of same (see notes).

Step 3. Small groups review and discuss definition of ‘violence’—report to large group.

- Record on whiteboard. Record on worksheet 2.

Step 4. Whole group brainstorm and record ways in which violence is present in reality. (This should include: war, sports, crime, domestic and acquaintance violence etc.) Record types on worksheet 2. Links between types may be identified, e.g. domestic violence—child abuse/wife abuse/husband abuse/aged persons abuse/siblings abuse etc.

Homework

Collect examples of violence in society from photos, newspaper clippings, magazines etc., or other sources. Bring paste and scissors to next session.
Module 1 — Violence in Society — Perceptions

This module is used to introduce the broad concepts of violence and to explore the presence of violence in society. It begins by asking students to recall violence viewed on TV and video, and then asks students to relate this information to reality.

Procedure

Step 1. Brain-storm violence viewed on video and TV — record on whiteboard. This may include news footage of wars, riots, domestic violence, murders, etc.; movie footage of gangsters, futuristic 'warriors', war, etc., and cartoons or advertisement footage, i.e. Ninja Turtles, Road Runner, 'terminator' type toys, video games, etc.

Using worksheet 1 students select items from the whiteboard lists and record on the worksheet in appropriate categories. Students are being asked to differentiate real, representational and fantasy violence.

Step 2. Divide class into small groups to discuss their individual choices/decisions. Do all students agree on what is 'real' violence? Are they able to differentiate between 'real' (what has actually happened) and what was made to look real (i.e. represented reality)?

Information for discussion

At this point give students some information about the different levels of impact for each type of violence portrayed. Real violence has the greatest impact or shock; representational violence can also shock — it is created to do so — but viewers are able to reason that it is not real; fantasy violence is generally seen as 'pretend' and is rarely shocking.

• Sometimes 'real' violence is accepted by society e.g. sports injuries inflicted deliberately; police rough handling of demonstrators; army personnel using physical force against enemy prisoners. — Why is it that this is seen as a more 'reasonable' use of violence? (e.g. both parties are involved in conflict through choice — they 'agree' to
participate. Reciprocal violence is not the same as offender-victim violence.) Is this an acceptable explanation? Is violence sometimes OK?

- We sometimes assume that watching any form of violence will make us become ‘violent’. Is that true? Does watching ‘Terminator’ type movies make people want to physically injure other people?
- Does watching the Ninja Turtles make children violent?

In fact, most people do not respond that way. It is part of our socialisation process to watch and reject the exaggerated movie violence portrayed. Children will often pretend to be violent but most do not become really violent towards other children. Research has shown (Lefkowitz, 1978; Bandura, 1969) that children who are already identified as genuinely ‘violent’ will select violent viewing and continue to do so into adulthood; children who watch ‘pretend’ violence will often copy the pretend violence when permitted to do so.

Pretend violence is not real violence.
Pretending to be violent is different to really being violent.
Pretending to shoot, stab or kill does not indicate a child would really do this.

However, sometimes they become overexcited and pretend violence changes to real violence. Children in play sometimes start out pretending to be violent and end up hurting each other.

- Should we abolish all violence in TV/movie viewing? Why? Why not?
- Is there a difference between real and simulated violence in terms of impact on behaviour? The research tells us that some people are affected by both, some by neither. The impact of viewing violence, may be great when we consider that children often learn through ‘copying’ and ‘modelling’ others.

The conclusions to be drawn here are that it cannot be shown that all people who watch violence become violent. Most of us do not. But because violence viewing can impact on behaviour it is desirable to restrict such viewing.

**Step 3.** Students remain in small groups and decide on a definition of violence (see examples below)—it should contain some reference to the deliberate inflicting of harm or hurt on another person or on property. Allow students to offer wording. Record on whiteboard and students record on worksheet 2.

- Suggested definitions (violence, aggression, assault, bullying):
'violence is a deliberate act resulting in physical or emotional hurt to another person or damage to property'

'Aggression is the intention to hurt or emerge superior to others without necessarily involving physical injury' (Siann, 1988)

Violence: 'Use of great force or physical intensity' (Siann, 1988)
Assault—legal definition:

'any behaviour that presents a clear and immediate threat of physical injury'
(Smith, 1983)
Does not include verbal abuse
Does not include property

Bullying—'repeated aggression conducted by an individual or group against others'
(Byrne, 1994)

Step 4. Clean whiteboard—ask students to write down as many different types of real violence as they can think of in one minute without conferring with others. Use the whiteboard to record types of real violence. Introduce the broad categories of Family, Community, National.

Record on worksheet 2 — types of violence.

Examples include:
Family—domestic/child abuse, infanticide, bullying, rape, sexual abuse
Community—sport, political demonstrations, crime, harrassment (based on sex, religion, ethnic background)
National—war, civil unrest, terrorism

Point out that each of the broad categories of violence have similarities in that the violence often results from conflict and the choice to deal with conflict using violence instead of negotiation, discussion, etc.

Record on worksheet 2. How are some of these linked?

Homework

Students are asked to collect newspaper clippings, photos and magazine articles related to violence—they should be encouraged to search through their own choice of magazine, such as surfing, skateboard, football, fashion and beauty magazines—some surprising attitudes are expressed in these publications! They will also need paste and scissors.
Module 2 (Joint)

Violence in society — Statistics

Outcomes

Students will:
- Analyse statistical information regarding violence in Australia;
- Make predictions and draw conclusions based on the statistical data;
- Differentiate groups in society who are most at risk of violence and who engage most often in violence;
- Discuss and list types of violence; and
- Demonstrate the ability to classify types of violence by collating specific categories from a variety of examples.

Focus

The information students should acquire during this session relates to media reporting of incidence, frequency and different types of violence. Comparison of this information with the statistics will be likely to demonstrate that the most frequent types of violence occurring statistically are not necessarily reflected in media reports.

Student activities

During this module students will:
1. Review individual examples of violence collected since first session.
2. Collate examples in categories defined by themselves.
3. Create a collage and display.
4. Complete worksheet 3 — prediction and analysis of statistical data.
Procedure

Step 1. Review examples of violence collected since first session—students discuss the photo/media report and other examples individually in large group.
- Discuss with students what categories the violence can be sorted into—male to male, groups, international, children, females, homicide, assault, fantasy, reality, etc. and sort accordingly.

Step 2. Place students into small groups to create a collage of examples and illustrate categories—product should be displayed.

Step 3. Predict the categories most likely to be represented in statistics. In small groups discuss and record.

Step 4. Examine and discuss the statistics. (See presenter notes)
- Compare with predictions and discuss.

Homework

Collect further examples of violence, preferably with photos or pictures of locations, incidents, people.
Module 2 — Violence in Society — Statistics

This module helps students develop a realistic perception of violence in Australian society. They will be asked to bring collected photos, media reports, magazines, etc. for discussion; to sort these into various categories and to develop a group collage to illustrate a given category, e.g. international violence; violence against children; violence in movies. Students will also predict and analyse statistical data regarding incidence and categories of violence.

Procedure

Step 1. Involve students in large group discussion of the samples they have collected—they may describe the incident reported, where it occurred, etc., or show the picture and explain the circumstances.

- Ask students to decide what categories of violence they can be sorted into—record examples on the whiteboard. This acts as a revision of information from the last session (e.g. international, family, community, national, etc.).

Step 2. Divide into small groups and provide butchers paper to each group. They are to create a collage which illustrates a particular category of violence and they should think of a slogan or statement which indicates an appropriate attitude towards the violence shown (e.g. children should be protected from violence). Students can display work. (15 minutes)

Step 3. As a large group students should use worksheet 3 to predict the categories of violence they believe will be represented in the statistics. Rather than including all types and categories, the worksheet asks which acts of violence they predict will be most frequent in the statistics and students should be encouraged to think about their perceptions. Who is most at risk of death or injury from violence? Overall, they should become aware that males are by far the most violent people in society as well as being the most likely victims.

Step 4. Use OHTs 1-6, to introduce broad statistics to the group—ask students to record the percentage on the worksheet. Relate these statistics to the predictions and discuss.

- Students should complete ‘actual incidence’ section after discussion of the statistics.
Module 3 (Joint)

Predicting violence

Outcomes

Students will:
- Demonstrate knowledge of the indicators of violence in interpersonal and situational incidents;
- Discuss the role of emotions in violence; and
- Discuss the role of substances in violence.

Focus

As a result of this session students will become familiar with the physiological, behavioural and emotional indicators of violence in others and their own individual preferred interaction style which may determine their responses in a conflict situation.

Student activities

During this module students will:
1. Review the examples collected and/or collages made previously, to determine emotions present, cycles of interaction and physiological indicators in violent situations.
   \[ W4 \]
   Record on worksheets 4 and 5.
   \[ W5 \]
2. Identify own style of relating to others (worksheet 6) by completing questionnaire.
   \[ W6 \]
**Procedure**

**07** Steps 1–2. Students examine in small groups the examples of violence collected and discuss 'indicators'.

- Whole group sharing of examples—record on whiteboard in categories not labelled as physiological, behavioural and emotional indicators (see notes for procedure details).

**W4** Steps 3–6. Give information to students regarding physiology, emotions and behaviour (see notes).

**W5**

- **Physiology** — bodily and facial signs; worksheet 4;
- **Behaviour** — effects of substances (drugs, alcohol)
  worksheet 5;
- **Emotions** — presence or absence of anger, other emotions (fear, frustration, jealousy, revenge);
  worksheet 5;
  — control of emotions.

**W6**

Step 7. Students complete 'Relating to Others' Scale (worksheet 6).

**Homework**

Conduct TV survey. Worksheet 7.

Bring textas/ruler/pens to next session.
Module 3 — Predicting violence

In this module students are asked to consider a range of visible indicators of violence in an effort to assist them to predict violence. The notion that violence always results from an angry conflict is challenged and they are asked to consider a number of other sources impacting on violence, including various emotions, the effects of substances and interpersonal interactions. Students are also asked to do some introspection regarding their own ways of relating to others and to consider how this could impact on their responses to, or use of, violence.

Procedure

Step 1. Students should examine, in small groups, the collage illustrations of categories of violence which they created in the last session and/or the samples collected since.

Step 2. You will ask the students to consider what indication of violence could have been evident in the time leading up to the incident. How could they tell this was a violent incident, or was going to become a violent incident?

What you want from students is a list of the obvious physiological, behavioural and emotional signals—but do not use these terms to begin with:

- as students name the indicators, e.g. red in face; clenched fists; went to get gun; followed victim home; yelled abuse, etc., you should record on the whiteboard in unnamed groups.

Examples:

- red in face
- quick breathing
- tense body
- sweating
- pale
- drunk
- drugged
- following victim
- grabbing victim
- yelling abuse
- kidnap
- buying gun
- jealous
- angry
- afraid
- 'upset'
- rejected
- frustrated
Step 3. You will then ask students for an appropriate label for each category and they will hopefully suggest labels such as physical/physiological signs; behavioural signs; emotions or feelings as signs. If not forthcoming from students, you should provide the label. Record agreed label for each list on whiteboard.

Examples:

**Physical**
- red in face
- quick breathing
- tense body
- sweating
- pale
- drunk
- drugged

**Behavioural**
- following victim
- grabbing victim
- yelling abuse
- kidnap
- buying gun

**Emotional**
- angry
- afraid
- ‘upset’
- rejected
- frustrated
- jealous

Inform students that you will now discuss each category.

Step 4. Physical indicators

Students now complete worksheet 4 which is the same as OHT 7.

- Give information regarding physiology — it is helpful if the presenters draw the appropriate lines on OHT 7 as they tell the students what to write.

Label notes:

1. Thoughts of conflict; anxiety; stress; confusion.
2. Sometimes hard to speak.
3. Heart rate increases.
   (Note: the heart rate increases in preparation for the conflict, this re-directs the blood flow to extremities of body—away from brain.)
4. Breathing increases.
5. Adrenalin released.
   (Note: the experience of ‘butterflies’ in the tummy or a sharp sensation indicates the release of the hormone adrenalin to assist in physical efforts to avoid or conduct violence.)
7. Fight response.
   (Note: the extremities of the body are prepared for fighting or fleeing the conflict.)

Students record information on worksheet 4.
Step 5. **Behavioural indicators**

Behaviour during conflict can be affected by emotions, thoughts and substances as well as other factors including the environment.

- Thoughts—self-talk which suggests calming down and deep breathing will be more effective in reducing levels of stress and conflict than thoughts which suggest to us all kinds of blood-thirsty revenge! Remind students that they can control one thought at a time and that this will assist in reducing inappropriate choices of behaviour.

- Substances—some explanatory notes

Being under the influence of drugs or alcohol is sometimes used as an excuse in violent incidents—but generally people choose to take these substances into their bodies and must therefore accept the consequences. Students need to understand that it is not the substance which is the cause of violence, but the person who chooses to use them. Responsibility for the action must rest with the person who engages in the violent act. Such substances act as chemical triggers which free us from the social controls we usually employ, and impair our ability to choose appropriate actions.

Students should complete **top section of worksheet 5**.

Step 6. **Emotional indicators**

Discuss the **presence of a range of emotions** as indicators or predictors of violence. The concept of ‘catharsis’ should be explained. That is, the idea that you can ‘get rid of’ anger by engaging in some pseudo violence (e.g. punching a pillow) is not true.

Anger is not an emotion with a limited span which can be used up, it is an emotion which needs to be acknowledged and controlled as does any other emotion. It is also important for students to understand that anger is not an excuse for violence e.g. ‘I couldn’t control myself, I have a short fuse.’ Nor is anger always present during violent incidents. Some people choose to engage in violence for self-gratification and other rewards including acquiring property, sexual release, power, etc.

Anger is a normal emotion which should be expressed in a controlled fashion. It is often helpful to choose an activity which permits release without damage, such as a long walk, physical game of sport, talking it over, writing about the problem, etc. Have students suggest activities which they find helpful and which demonstrate alternatives to choosing violence when angry. Other emotions which may precede violence are rejection, jealousy, fear, etc.
Students complete 'main indicators of violence'.
1. physical,
2. behaviour,
3. emotions on Worksheet 5 and examples.

**Step 7.** Students can complete the 'Relating to Others' scale (*worksheet 6*). They will examine their own preferred response and behavioural style. With some knowledge of their own preferred response pattern and acceptance that not everyone responds the way they do, students may come to understand that getting along with others is possible. This is not meant to be an in-depth psychoanalytical tool but a light-hearted and positive means of illustrating that different personality types can come into conflict and will respond to conflict differently.

**NB.** *Distribute worksheet 7* (self-viewing survey) for next session. Students will need textas or coloured pens for next session.
Module 4 (Segregated)

Violence and gender

Outcomes

Students will:
- Identify gender differences in terms of recipients and perpetrators of violence;
- Discuss personal experiences of violence; and
- Discuss criminal/legal issues related to violence.

Focus

The information students should acquire relates to the gender imbalance in terms of violence perpetration. Students should become aware that violence is more usual in males and they should be able to express the differences verbally, in statistical form and using artistic media. The legal aspects of violence are discussed and specific terms clarified. Posters they create will be available for display during the program.

Student activities

During this session students will:
1. Collate information in small groups and present their findings to the whole group;
2. Produce a poster expressing gender differences in experiences and perceptions of violence; and
3. Record specific definitions for common terms used in discussing violence.
Procedure

**Step 1.** In small groups students refer to survey (worksheet 7 self-viewing) and collate information on personal observations. The group should record and discuss the gender differences in victims, perpetrators, types of violence viewed etc. (worksheet 8-lower section).

**Step 2.** Present findings to whole group.

**Step 3.** Each student in small groups will express own experiences of violence as victim, perpetrator, observer.

**Step 4.** Small groups will then develop a common theme for poster.
- Students create and present poster relating to own gender experiences of violence.

**Step 5.** Definitions of legal terms and criminality of violence discussed.

Homework

**W9** Survey Friends’ Viewing Choices—distribute Worksheet 9.
Module 4 — Violence and gender (Segregated)

This session is the first of the segregated sessions. It was felt, after a review of 'Violence Prevention' curricula from overseas, that a key element missing was gender differentiation in terms of the information provided and the experiences of students. Clearly, if young males are at greatest risk from each other, and young females are also at greatest risk from young males, the target population of young males needs specific information and skills development, which is probably different to that needed by young females. Young female students need more information about predicting, avoiding, and help seeking with regard to violence. Young males need to be alerted to their greater risk and the importance of rejecting violence as a means of resolving conflict, particularly in intimate relationships. Although the module is written with the same basic contents for both groups, the outcomes are often different as the single gender groups seem to feel more comfortable discussing the issues relating to them specifically.

Procedure

W7 Step 1. Students will have completed the top section of worksheet 7 on self-viewing of TV reports and stories about violence. This will have been done as homework following module 3.

- Students will discuss each other’s results and record real and fictional incidents in the top section of worksheet 8. In small groups they should discuss the gender differences in victims, offenders, types of violence that are evident from the survey. They should record this information on worksheet 8 as they collate from each other’s summary sheet.
- In all probability, there will be differences in these categories based on gender:-
  - for all students: it is important to discuss the types of incidents portrayed in the fictional stories—do they bear any resemblance to the reality of violence in society? Refer to statistical information or student worksheets if necessary. Report to large group on findings. It is important that students begin to relate their perceptions of violence to the reality of violence in society.
Step 2. Present findings to whole group.

Step 3. In small groups, students will share their own impression of violence as an observer, victim and/or offender.

NB: This section should be treated with sensitivity as it could be addressing incidents of personal violence, and of course no student should be put in the position of discussing private matters if there are any unresolved feelings, or feeling of threat evident. Counselling support should be available for students expressing a need to access it and they should be made aware of this before any disclosure occurs. However, it is important to the impact of this curriculum that students be given opportunities to realise (i.e. make real sense of) the information as it relates to their own lives. We cannot continue to believe that such incidents only ever happen to others, and to maintain the comfortable distance from the issues that that allows. Therefore you should encourage students to look at all aspects of violence—as a recipient (or a victim) and as an observer, or even as an offender. We have all engaged in some incidents which we would now regard as unnecessarily violent, and this can be shared unemotionally with the group.

Step 4. As a small group, the students will develop a common theme for a poster based on an experience of violence or a particular gender issue.

- Male students may be interested in producing a poster which illustrates the fact that most males are not violent, that most males reject violence and abuse; they may wish to express support or care for children by rejecting violence. They may also wish to express concern for the predominance of male perpetrators and victims; for the availability of guns, for the use of violence against women. The posters should reflect a male perspective which supports the basic philosophy of this curriculum which is anti-violence.

- Female students should attempt to illustrate a female perspective in their posters. They may wish to express concern at the risks women face from male violence, at the need to protect children, at the need to seek assistance for domestic violence; they may wish to make a statement about the strength of women as survivors and their contribution to an anti-violent culture. The posters should reflect a female perspective which supports the anti-violence philosophy of the curriculum.

Display posters.
Step 5. Definitions

There are formal terms which are commonly used when discussing various types of violence and which are often misunderstood. It is important for students to distinguish and use the correct terminology. It is also, at this point, relevant to introduce information regarding the criminality of violence and the legal consequences of particular actions. This section deals with these issues.

- Legal definitions of the following terms are provided: (see OHTs 1 and 16 — OHT 16 runs to 3 pages)
  - self-defence
  - assault
  - rape
  - manslaughter
  - criminal damage
  - sexual abuse or assault
  - homicide/murder
  - offensive weapons
  - child neglect

- The criminality of violence is also addressed in the reference provided and penalties are recorded on OHT 16.

Homework

Distribute worksheet 9—Survey Friends’ Viewing Choices. Ask students to interview three male and three female friends or family across a variety of age groups and record their viewing preferences and reasons for selection.
Module 5 (Segregated)

 Origins of violence

Outcomes

Students will:
- Develop an understanding of the external and internal origins of violence;
- Discuss the role of attitudes in violence (sexism, racism, homophobia, disability);
- Demonstrate these factors through role-play; and
- Acknowledge behavioural choice as a key factor.

Focus

The knowledge students should gain from this session involves understanding that violent acts have their origins within the individual as he/she responds to internal and external pressures. Developing awareness of emotional and behavioural factors and the possibility of choosing alternatives is a key aim.

Student activities

W9 During this module students will:
1. Engage in small group discussion—worksheet 9—survey friends’ viewing choices;
2. Role-play; and
3. Complete worksheet 10—origins of violence.

W10
Procedure

Step 1. Discuss survey of friends' viewing choices—are there differences in viewing choices for males/females? Discuss issues of violence viewing using focus questions.
- Discuss *interpersonal factors* in the development of violent behaviours:
  - *Attitudes*—sexism, racism, homophobia, disability, bullying;
  - *Emotions*—anger, fear, frustration, rejection, confusion, confidence.

Step 2. Role-play vignettes to demonstrate interpersonal origins of violence.

Step 3. Relate interpersonal factors to behavioural choices— appropriate/inappropriate.

Step 4. Discuss behavioural choices—brainstorm (see notes).

Homework

Distribute worksheet 11—A-B-C of violent incidents.
Module 5 — Origins of Violence (Segregated)

This module looks at factors which originate within individuals as they respond to external and internal pressures and contribute to violence. Students will discuss and demonstrate various attitudes and emotions and the different behavioural options available to deal with potentially violent situations.

Procedure

**Step 1.** Students will have collected survey information from family and friends on viewing selections (worksheet 9). In small groups students discuss their findings. Are there differences in viewing choices for males/females? For different age groups? Which group is more likely to select violent viewing, if any group did? Did any particular group feel that violence viewing would make people become violent? Discuss results and summarise verbally, with whole group.

Focus questions

* If people believe violence viewing causes violence do they still choose to watch it?
* Do they believe violence viewing causes others to become violent but not themselves?
* Do they differentiate between real and simulated (pretend) violence?
* Research indicates that those people who choose to interact violently in their relationships will often choose violent viewing, but the reverse is not necessarily true.

The next part of this module is to illustrate for students the impact of negative social attitudes and the possibility that violence is used to express such attitudes.

The students should be moved into different small groups—rotate membership so that all teams change from time to time.

**Step 2.** Each group is given a role play to act out in order to demonstrate a particular negative attitude or the presence of an extreme emotion. Students should not notify the rest of the class what attitude/
emotion they are demonstrating, the others should be able to guess from the role play what obvious attitudes and emotions are presented.

NB: Students may want to think of different role plays to demonstrate the attitudes and emotions—you should carefully monitor the content to ensure it fits with the intent of the activity. It is important during the role plays that attention is focused on the origins of violence.

- Male students are asked to illustrate homophobia, sexism, racism, bullying, discrimination based on disability. You may consider other negative attitudes which could be demonstrated. Vignette 1 illustrates an external origin of conflict—rejection and exclusion from the disco. The homophobic reaction of the young men is chosen as a means to express their hostile and angry feelings.

- Female students are asked to demonstrate sexism, bullying and the emotions of anger and frustration. Generally, female students will demonstrate the experience of receiving violence, although some of the vignettes require them to enact violence as perpetrators. Vignette 1 illustrates an external origin of frustration—the demanding children. The physically violent reaction is the chosen means of expressing the frustration and anger. For all role plays, the message is that, despite the fact that there are many external factors which frustrate, hurt and anger us, ultimately we must choose whether to deal with those feelings using violence or other means.

- This activity is more effective if videotaped and students are able to receive feedback. The actual footage will be referred to again in Module 6 when students are asked to demonstrate alternative approaches. Secure the agreement of students that their role plays can be used by the opposite gender group for feedback and discussion purposes.

\[W10\] Step 3. Having demonstrated the various attitudes and emotions, discuss with students the role of internal and external factors, emotions and attitudes in the perpetuation of violence. Record top section worksheet 10. The concept of choosing a violent response instead of a more appropriate response needs to be examined.
Q1. Do emotions cause violence?
[A] Emotions can create or result from conflict situations in which violence is the chosen response—emotions can and should be controlled so that more appropriate responses are selected.

Q2. Are people entitled to use violence to express negative social attitudes such as homophobia, sexism, racism?
[A] No.

Q3. Why do people choose violent responses to emotional and social conflict?
[A] – They do not stop and think of another response.
– They believe they are entitled to use violence.
– There are few negative consequences for using violence.
– They don’t know another way to deal with the conflict.

**Step 4.** Worksheet 10—*Origins of Violence (lower section)*
Ask students to brainstorm alternative behavioural choices. Some suggestions of appropriate behavioural responses:

– Inform someone in authority of the inappropriate behaviour.
– Inform the person who is behaving inappropriately that you want them to stop.
– Arrange a time to discuss your differences with the person.
– Be assertive in your approach to the person.
– Accept that there are differences among people and walk away.
– Discuss your complaint with someone who has the power to change things.
– Remove yourself from the situation.
– Engage in an activity which will give you temporary time-out from the situation (e.g. exercise, ride a bike, swim, walk, play with a ball, sing, read).
– Deep breathing helps in times of great emotion (fear, anger).
– Call a friend to discuss your feelings and the situation.

Record three choices you might use (on worksheet 10).

**Homework**

**W11** Distribute worksheet 11.
– Students to complete top section for homework.
– Observe an incidence of ‘violence’ and record the A-B-C.
Module 5

Interpersonal factors related to violence

(Vignettes for male students)

1. Homophobia and anger
   You attend a local disco with friends and are looking forward to a
   good time but the doorman refuses you entry because of the strict
dress code. You are furious to see two young men admitted after you—
their well-dressed appearance obviously indicates that they are ‘poofs’.
You decide to wait for them to leave the disco and ‘get them’.

2. Sexism and rejection
   You invite a young lady to dance at a party or social gathering. She
   refuses saying she is talking to her friends. Your friends make fun of
   your rejection but you decide she has no right to say no to you and
   you meet up with her as she leaves the party/gathering, threatening her
   and physically assaulting her.

3. Racism and frustration
   You have studied hard to complete a project at school and are pleased
   with the result of your efforts. However, when the results are posted
   the teacher makes a point of identifying the Chinese student in your
   class as the top performer. You stop him outside the school and abuse
   him for being a ‘gimp’, accusing him of crawling to the teachers and
   taking opportunities away from Australian students.

4. Disability and bullying
   A student in your class has mild cerebral palsy, and has the assistance
   of a teacher-aide to help him with tasks like lifting and carrying his
   equipment, manoeuvring his wheelchair about the school, etc. He gets
   more attention than you or any other student already, but when he is
called up at assembly and congratulated for his selection on the State
Paralympics basketball team your blood boils. You stop him on the
way to his bus and let him know what you think of ‘spastics’.

5. Bullying
   The little primary school kids who catch your bus home are noisy and
   overactive. You decide to show them who is boss and when they get off
   at your stop you follow them down the street taking their hats and
   bags and eventually hitting two of them, warning them not to tell or
   you’ll do worse tomorrow.
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Module 5

Interpersonal factors related to violence

(Vignettes for female students)

1. Frustration/anger
   You are the mother of two young children and have given up your job to care for them at home. Today, the baby is coming down with a cold and needs your full attention, but your two-year-old is eager to learn and play and demands you to join her. Her constant talking and noise have got on your nerves and you finally give her a thrashing and toss her into bed...

2. Fear, revenge, relationship violence
   Your husband has beaten you for the third time this week—he always does this when he has been drinking. The kids have also been hit tonight, and now, as you see him asleep in a drunken stupor on the lounge, you decide to end your misery.

3. Jealousy
   Your best friend accepts a lift with you and your boyfriend to a party. She has always told you how lucky you are to have such a great guy. Tonight she is dressed to kill and she flirts with Grant all evening. You eventually find them in a back room together—and they're not just talking! You immediately attack her—scratching, kicking and slapping her for taking your guy.

4. Bullying
   Your mother has always insisted that you help around the house and now that your ill grandmother is at home there is much more to do. One day you are left to care for your Gran while your mother is at work and you realise how easy it is to hurt and torment the feeble old lady—she can't even tell on you because she can't speak anymore...

5. Relationship violence
   You have been going out with Bob for 18 months and are really fond of him—he has a great sense of humour and is intelligent. However, lately he has been behaving in a very possessive way—asking for details of your every move when you are not with him, accusing you of sleeping with his friends. Tonight, after going out together for a few drinks with friends he hits you across the face and abuses you for flirting with his mates.
Module 6 (Segregated)

Preventing violence

Outcomes

Students will:
• Demonstrate an understanding of the antecedents to violence;
• Describe behaviours which reflect violence;
• Identify consequences which may reinforce violence; and
• Discuss video footage in relation to these factors.

Focus

The knowledge/information students will gain from this session relates to understanding that violent behaviours are a result of a set of circumstances which precede and follow the action and that different behaviours can be selected in an attempt to de-escalate the situation.

Student activities

During this module students will:
1. Engage in small group discussion.
2. View video footage and analyse/or role-play other group vignettes from session 5.
3. Complete worksheet 12—Feedback A-B-C.

Procedure

Step 1. Review homework—worksheet 11—Discuss A-B-C.
Step 2. Using video footage taped previously, students view and discuss the situations portrayed.
• Students are advised to identify preceding circumstances to the violence—term 'antecedent' introduced.
• Students observe and describe violent *behaviours*.
• Students identify *consequences* which may reinforce the violence.

**W12**  *Step 3.* Students re-enact role plays demonstrating different behaviours and outcomes despite same antecedents. Feedback using worksheet 12 (alternatives).

## Homework

Students should observe themselves in a conflict situation and record the A-B-C on the lower section worksheet 12. They should also indicate their appropriate behavioural choices.
Module 6 — Preventing violence
(Segregated)

Resources needed
Video player and videos of student role plays from Module 5 and TV or screen.

The focus of this module is on the antecedent-behaviour-consequence cycle which violent behaviour follows. Students will be helped to identify and describe the cycle for various incidents and will be given information about interrupting the negative cycle by using positive behaviours and strategies.

Procedure

W1. Step 1. Using worksheet 11 students in small groups discuss incident observed and A-B-C components—emphasising the meanings (A-B-C) not the terms. Ask ‘what happened immediately before the incident?’

W2. Step 2. View video footage from previous week as a class group (students view own vignettes or the male/female swap arranged previously is implemented).
Discuss situation 1 portrayed, to establish the general type of violence/aggression/emotion demonstrated (males = homophobia, females = frustration), rewind video to start of situation 1.
Note incident observed on worksheet 12.

W3. Step 3. Introduce the term ‘antecedent’. What behaviours or incidents preceded the violence?

situation 1 males — homophobia
antecedent: rejection from disco; planning to ‘get the poofs’
situation 1 female — frustration
antecedents: toddler noise/demands

Ask students to observe and record on worksheet 12 under ‘incident observed’ — antecedent.

I. Students should next observe the actual behaviours engaged in by the perpetrator of the violence and record this on worksheet 12 — e.g:
situation 1 male — homophobia
behaviours: verbal abuse, physical abuse
situation 1 female—frustration

behaviours: verbal reprimands to child, hitting child

2. Record consequences:
Situation 1 male—criminal activity and injury to other person
Situation 2 female—more anger, noise as child cries

3. Students are now asked to suggest alternative behaviours which could lead to better consequences. Record under ‘alternatives’. The antecedents are the same.

e.g.
Situation 1 male
alternative behaviours:
• discuss with disco staff how to gain entry
• go home or to another venue

Situation 1 female
alternative behaviours:
• distract child or
• take outside to play

The consequences of these alternative behaviours are more positive, safer and less damaging.
Situation 1 male—no-one would be hurt
Situation 1 female—child would be happier

Step 4. Divide the group into small groups. They will now review a role play and suggest more positive means of responding e.g:

situation 1 female—frustration
antecedent—child noise and demands (interrupt by removing self, reassuring child, going out, seeking help or respite, giving alternative activities to child, etc.);
behaviour—smacking/hitting child (interrupt by selecting an alternative behaviour—as suggested above);
consequence—more noise/anger/frustration as child cries—no relief from problem—change to antecedent and behaviour will change consequence—child is distracted, happier, receives positive attention.

This could be video recorded to reinforce the positive outcomes and delete the original footage.
This module needs to be undertaken systematically and carefully—not all vignettes may be examined due to time. It is better to examine two or three in some depth and discuss alternative responses.

The most important factor to pass on to students is that the perpetrator, and not someone 'in authority', is responsible for halting the violence, for finding alternative responses. Violence is a 'choice' for which the chooser is responsible. Emphasis should be placed on the crucial notions of self-control and responsibility.

They should also understand that simply because they 'get away with' violence doesn't make it OK. This thinking means that the perpetrator believes someone else is responsible for stopping them from using violence and it is crucial to discuss and reject that notion.

**Homework**

Students take home worksheet 12 and record on lower section an incident in which they were involved and chose a non-violent response.
Module 7 (Segregated)

Responding to violence

Outcomes

Students will:
- Identify potentially violent situations;
- Judge own competence to handle or avoid the conflict; and
- Select appropriate response.

Focus

The knowledge and skills gained through this session relates to ‘fight or flight’ responses to violence. Students should be able to determine that ‘flight’ responses are appropriate if negotiation fails, to whom they should report incidents, where help is available and how to access help and when ‘fighting back’ is appropriate.

Student activities

During this module students will engage in:
1. Small group discussion.
2. Role plays.

Procedure

Step 1. Discuss the various behavioural choices possible for responding to violence/aggression/bullying, i.e. ‘fight’, ‘flight’, negotiation, help seeking, reporting.

Step 2. In small groups—students nominate a situation in which these responses are appropriate:
1. fight—fight back—refusing to comply with bully
2. flight—when threatened with physical harm
3. negotiation—when accused or blamed/when assertiveness needed
4. help seeking—when injured or threatened
5. reporting—to relevant authorities for actual violence/harm or threats
   Record on worksheet 13.

Step 3. Each group contributes one example to the discussion—record on whiteboard.

Homework

View TV or video program and identify types of 'relationship' violence.

[Worksheet 14]
During this module students are asked to examine responses to real or threatened violence and to determine the most effective response choice for various situations. The module reinforces the notion that premeditation is an essential ingredient to responses and that emotional responses such as fear and anger can contribute to a positive outcome if acknowledged and directed appropriately.

Procedure

Step 1. As a whole group discuss and record on the whiteboard the range of responses possible when they are threatened with or encounter violence, bullying, aggression—the list should include:

1. Fight
   - physical or verbal aggression in response to threat
   - physical or verbal resistance to threat

2. Flight
   - run away, escape or quietly leave immediately or at planned opportunity

3. Negotiation
   - talking and discussing differences calmly

4. Help seeking
   - finding somebody to give support and assistance to you

5. Reporting
   - knowing how to report incidents and to whom

This step may take some time as students discuss the acceptability of each of these responses. It is the presenter's role to maintain focus on what are likely to be the most effective and least harmful responses. Fighting back physically is, of course, the least recommended, but can students think of a situation when it may be used as a last resort? (kidnap attempt, physical attack)—only on the rarest occasion. It would be quite unrealistic to suggest that, in the interests of non-violence we should allow ourselves to be attacked without attempting some sort of defence—whether to shout out or to resist. This is certainly not the same as violent behaviour for its own sake or used as a pre-emptive strike.
In discussing 'reporting' the notion of 'dobbing' is often raised. This Australian sacred cow is sometimes interpreted to mean that nobody should ever tell anybody in authority about somebody else's behaviour. Please clarify for participants that while it is not necessary to 'dob' on people whose rule-breaking behaviour affects only themselves (e.g. having chewing gum at school when it is banned or wagging school), it is important to differentiate these from behaviours which could affect or be harmful to others (e.g. threatening others with a weapon, or lighting a fire). Establish when 'dobbing' is really legitimate reporting.

Step 2. In small groups—students nominate one situation for each response listed to illustrate the appropriateness of the response for the situation, and develop a role play to demonstrate.

Fight
You are not asking students to demonstrate a ‘fight’, but rather the concept of ‘sticking up for’ themselves by refusing to comply with a bully (peer or adult). Assertiveness, not aggression is the key. They could demonstrate refusal to hand over money demanded by a peer; or refusal to accept a physical assault (push, etc.) from an adult or peer etc.

Flight
Male students, in particular, should not see this as a negative response, but all students should be encouraged to see that ‘removal of self from the situation’ is often sensible and can be life-preserving. Judgement is required, as students demonstrate, e.g. taking a short cut home when several armed peers are coming your way; leaving the scene of a fight etc.

Negotiation
This is using assertive communication to state their own viewpoints in some situations.

Students may wish to demonstrate:
1. A discussion with an employer over an increase to wages.
2. A discussion with parents over the balance in social life/homework.
3. A discussion with an older brother about use of your belongings.
Example:
1. Employer will give more money if student agrees to an additional duty at work, e.g. sweeping floors, emptying garbage.

Help seeking/Reporting
All students should be encouraged to see these as responsible decisions which will lead to consequences for the perpetrator, and an improved situation for them.
Discuss with whole group
Record on worksheet 13.

Homework

Distribute worksheet 14—types of relationship violence.
Students will view TV (or examine other media), identify and record types of relationship violence.
Module 8 (Joint)

Violence in relationships

Outcomes

Students will:

- Identify the types of violence in relationships;
- Record types of violence in relationships; and
- Relate information to the statistics for violence.

Focus

The knowledge gained through this session enables students to link their own observations and the statistical reality of violence in relationships to clarify the real risk areas.

Student activities

During this module students will engage in:

1. Whole group discussion;
2. Small group discussion; and
3. Role play.

Procedure

Step 1. Discuss preceding segregated modules as a large group.

Step 2. In small groups students record types of interpersonal relationships.

Step 3. Following feedback to large groups, small groups now list the types of violence to be found in these relationships.

Step 4. Rotate groups and now identify professional relationships and types of violence possible (doctor, teacher, club leader etc.).
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• Feedback to large group.

**Step 5.** Review homework worksheet 14.

**Step 6.** Review statistics and identify key relationships for risk.

**Step 7.** Hypothetical—several students are nominated to take part in the hypothetical which is conducted by the teacher (see hypothetical script).

The hypothetical will explore a variety of types of relationships violence, demonstrating the negative attitudes, stereotypes and inappropriate behaviours evident in society and ways of reversing these.

**Homework**

**Step 16.** Distribute worksheet 16—non-violent response to conflict.
Watch for and record examples of non-violent/non-aggressive responses in conflict interactions observed. What were the outcomes?
Module 8 — Violence in relationships (Joint)

Resources needed
Hypothetical script

The purpose of this module is to enable students to demonstrate through role play their understanding of the opposing views in society with relation to the use of physical punishment and physical abuse in relationships. The module will act as a forum for students to show their understanding of the issues, and provides the opportunity for them to express viewpoints in role play which may otherwise not be accepted. Students will also discuss relationships violence in personal and professional situations.

Procedure

This is the first time which male and female students have attended jointly for four sessions and some settling in may be required.

Have the large group segregated into males and females to begin with.

Step 1. Spokespersons for each gender group could briefly summarise what they have been studying in this program over the past weeks, and identify the different emphases relative to gender.

Have several members of each gender group ask members of the other questions relating to issues covered in the preceding modules e.g:

[MARY] ‘Ricky, how did the videotaped role plays help you understand the origins of violence?’

[BILL] ‘Sue, what is the A-B-C of violence?’

Step 2. In mixed small groups—students brainstorm as many combinations of interpersonal relationships as they can think of and collectively list, e.g. married and unmarried partners, girl/boyfriend, parents/child, mother/child, father/child, other relatives, brother/sister etc., young adults with family/friends (worksheet 15, part 1).

• Share these with large group—record on whiteboard if required.
• Small groups now list the types of violence/aggression which can be found in these relationships (date rape, rape in marriage, bullying.)
incest, physical violence, domestic violence). Record on worksheet 15, part 2.

**Step 3.** Rotate group membership—students are now to identify professional relationships and the types of violence which may be possible in these relationships, e.g:

- doctor—sexual assault, euthanasia
- teacher—physical assault, sexual assault, psychological assault
- police—physical assault
- sports coach—physical, psychological assault

Record on lower section of worksheet 15, parts 3 & 4.

This is an aspect of relationships violence which is often not recognised and is brought to the attention of students for this purpose. A degree of sensitivity is required and colourful personal examples are probably not appropriate at this time!

- Feedback to whole group—discussion of consequence/frequency of relationships violence (see statistics OHTs, Module 2).

**Step 4.** Review homework—students discuss the relationships violence/aggression viewed or observed. Which relationships seem to involve the most violence? Who are the most vulnerable/likely victims in relationships violence? Do any of the examples viewed involve professional relationship violence?

**Step 5.** Review/recall statistics (OHTs,) to see if the examples viewed are reflected in reality.

**Step 6.** Undertake hypothetical as a light-hearted means of illustrating various viewpoints. The scenario has been chosen as a rather unlikely one to permit students to use fantasy to express the concepts this module explores. While 'humour' is acceptable in terms of character names etc.—it is not OK to laugh at people being victimised. The teacher should carefully guide student debate in this activity.

---

**Homework**

Students should be encouraged to bring various telephone directories to next session.
Hypothetical module 8 —
Relationships violence

In Miseryville most relationships involve some degree of violence. This seems to be accepted by the town until a busload of tourists becomes stranded there and they begin to question the way Miseryites relate to each other.

1. When checking into the motel, Mr and Mrs Good observe Mr and Mrs Smacker—Mr Smacker hits his wife for being too slow at getting the key, he kicks her as she leaves the office to show the Goods their room. They are appalled and decide to confront Mr Smacker about his behaviour. (Mr Smacker rationalises his behaviour by saying that his wife is a very slow worker—she deserves it/needs it.)

2. Mrs Smacker looks defensive about her husband but proceeds to demonstrate her acceptance of the violence by hitting her child. The Goods decide to report this to Judge Mental, who is a tourist on their bus trip. Judge Mental sets up a court in the dining room.

3. The court room is divided between townspeople who believe in physical punishment and the tourists who are horrified at what they have seen.

4. The Smackers are accused of abuse and both sides call witnesses to support their argument. Smacker calls Miss Treatment—school teacher who uses the cane; Goods call Dr Bill Large to support views regarding the physical and psychological harm caused by violence.

5. The jury of three townspeople and three bus tourists discusses the case in light of Miseryville standards and social norms outside the town.

Issues raised include:

• the assertion that violence ‘works’ in keeping some members of the community under control. This is a common view, and one which should be challenged. Of course violence and bullying ‘work’ if what we want is a society of compliant and fearful wives and children, but it is not acceptable if our aim is to provide equality and fairness and to teach children that discussion and negotiation are valuable skills to use instead of violence.
• the belief that some people should just do as others tell them or risk being 'punished' should also be explored. What we really want in society is people who are able to make responsible non-violent decisions in their interactions with others.

• the idea that physical violence observed in another person's life is none of our business should be discussed—behaviour which is clearly harmful to another person should not be left unchallenged, and should be reported.

6. The verdict is about to be delivered when an announcement is made to the courtroom that Miseryville is being invaded by hostile aliens and everyone needs to be armed with a gun to save their own lives…
Module 9 (Joint)

Seeking help to avoid violence

Outcomes

Students will:

- Identify specific help agencies through reference to general directories;
- Demonstrate a capacity to understand the functions of the agency; and
- Relate assistance availability to specific groups in society.

Focus

Students will acquire knowledge related to specific avenues for assistance which people under threat of or experiencing actual violence can access. They will also analyse the availability of such assistance to various gender and age groups, and identify gaps in the services.

Student activities

During this module students will engage in:

1. Small group discussion;
2. Research (telephone directories); and
3. Role plays.

Procedure

W16 Step 1. Review homework—worksheet 16—non-violent responses to incidents.
Steps 2-4. Distribute telephone directories and instruct students to identify as many help phone numbers as possible in small groups. (Retain list to compile a help directory.) Identify gaps in the services e.g. for children.

Step 5. Role-play making a telephone call to a help number and explaining the situation. Do males/females have the same access to help? Why?
• Discuss in small groups where people under threat of, or who are victims of, violence can seek help if telephone access is not possible.

Step 6. Identify the difficulties in social, emotional and practical terms for people needing assistance, and other agencies available to help.

Homework

Make a phone call to a help number and inquire about the procedures/access/help available. Worksheet 17.
Presenter notes

Module 9 — Seeking help to avoid violence

Resources needed
Various telephone directories (local, district, general, community, business).

The purpose of this module is to engage students in a very practical exercise to inform them of the availability of services to assist in the event of a violent incident, and to compile a help directory which could be distributed or made available to students and/or the community.

Procedure

W16 Step 1. Homework review—worksheet 16 ‘non-violent response to conflict’—and encourage students to identify and discuss successful alternative responses where violence was not used to resolve a problem. Students retain worksheet 16 for use in Module 10.

W17 Step 2. Distribute various types of telephone directories to small groups. Students are to identify as many ‘help’ phone numbers and organisations as possible—these could include domestic violence, rape, child abuse, aged care, nursing mothers, youth, police etc.

- They should record three each on worksheet 17 (top section).

Step 3. By retaining this information and collecting it students can contribute to the compilation of a ‘help directory’—suggest ways of organising the information—what headings could be used? How could it be distributed?

Step 4. Ask students to identify gaps in the services e.g. can children access helpline information and assistance? Do males and females have equal access? How can this be addressed?

Step 5. In pairs, students can role-play making a telephone call for help to a listed number. They can demonstrate the perceived responses and situations which such a call would involve. For homework students will be asked to contact one such number and inquire about the service.

- Discuss access and services for males and females.
Step 6. Discuss other agencies available for assistance in the event of violence.
- neighbours, friends, family
- police, doctors, hospital, church, cultural groups
- charitable organisations (Salvation Army, Smith Family, Wayside Chapel etc.)

- Why is it that people, particularly women do not always access these agencies? Discuss (shame, guilt, fear of reprisal, lack of response or assistance offered, inability to locate or contact, emotional dependency etc.).
- Ask students how victims of violence can be encouraged to seek help (availability advertised, assistance assured, ease of access, no 'strings' attached—no judgement etc.).

Students should complete this module on a hopeful note—they should feel empowered that there are many avenues for assistance and that they should be called on as needed without shame, guilt or fear.
Module 10 (Joint)

Effective communication

Outcomes

Students will:

- Practice communicating their thoughts and ideas without full use of all faculties;
- Demonstrate the ability to communicate despite difficulties imposed;
- Demonstrate the difference between assertiveness and aggressiveness in verbal interactions;
- Define assertiveness; and
- Use assertive verbal interactions in role play situations.

Focus

The session will impart information and experiences related to the many facets of effective communication. It is hoped that these skills will be generalised to everyday interactions.

Students will be able to state and demonstrate the difference between assertive and aggressive interactions and relate these to everyday situations.

Student activities

W18 During this module students will engage in:

1. Role play;

W19 2. Peer feedback; and

**Procedure**

**Step 1.** Review homework—worksheet 17 seeking help.

**Step 2.** Introductory information re 'communication' and aspects of communication; students observe teacher and note the physical, verbal, and emotional aspects of communication.

**Step 3.** Activities

The three activities are described and students work in small groups to complete each task—rotate after five minutes at each task:

- [a] SPACE WALK
- [b] ART ATTACK
- [c] FILTHY RICH

Group discussion of outcomes.

**Step 4.** Review worksheet 16—non-violent responses to conflict, concentrating on the communication styles evident and words/tone used to manage the situation.

**Step 5.** Discuss with class the difference between assertiveness and aggressiveness in verbal interactions; use OHTs 9 to 15.

**Step 6.** Students engage in role plays to demonstrate assertiveness in real life situations (see attached role play examples).

- Students observe and provide written feedback for team members.

Complete Attitude Scale, Concepts Questionnaire, Evaluation.
Module 10 — Effective communication (Joint)

Resources needed
- OHTs 9 to 15,
- Diagrams for description in activity [b]
- List of articles activity [a]
- Worksheet 16 responses

This module is focused on communication and attempts to demonstrate the various modes of communication (both verbal and non-verbal) that it is possible to use to send and receive messages during interactions. The activities are fun and should provide the opportunity for students to observe others attempting to communicate, in a relaxed atmosphere.

This module also aims to equip students with an understanding of the difference between aggressiveness and assertiveness in personal relationships and life situations, and to develop appropriate assertive verbal skills for dealing with everyday experiences.

Procedure

Step 1. Homework Review. Discuss worksheet 17—contacting a ‘help line’.

Step 2. Introduce students to the concept of communication—verbal and non-verbal—instruct them to observe you—your verbal and non-verbal messages will be clear if you pretend to be angry, nervous etc. Have some students mime particular messages (disappointment, lottery win, dead dog etc.). Refer in particular to the relevant components of communication listed on worksheet 19, and which they will use to provide feedback to each other during the role plays.

Step 3. Introduce the three activities a, b, c to give an opportunity to try communicating without the usual benefits of sight, speech, writing—do not spend too long on this section!

You may wish to divide the class into several small groups and have them work through the problem before showing the large group, or you may have each small group come forward and demonstrate for the class in an impromptu fashion.
Activity a] SPACE WALK
Describe a scenario where the group has been stranded on a strange planet and they are unable to speak to each other because of their breathing helmets (or your own variation on this!). Give them the list of items below and direct them to decide which are the most important or essential to their survival—no use of words allowed! Communication often occurs without language that is oral—ask them to show this.

Activity b] ART ATTACK
Have students sit back-to-back. One has the artwork or other describable design or logo; the other has pencil and paper. The idea is for the first student to describe the artwork or design without saying what it is and the other student is meant to draw from this description to reproduce the design. This illustrates the power and complexity of language in communication and the difficulty in interpreting others’ meanings sometimes.

Activity c] FILTHY RICH
Have a small group devise a complex campaign to make a charity rich—instruct them that only verbal communication can be used so all the ideas will need to be remembered and rehearsed to present to the class. This activity demonstrates the need we have for written communication to maintain ideas and record meaning.

W16 Step 4. Discuss homework observations—worksheet 16—in which students were asked to demonstrate real-life or fictional non-violent responses to conflict. Ask them to focus on the communication in the situation (verbal and non-verbal)—what non-aggressive responses were observed being used to solve problems? What was the result?

W18 Step 5. Using the OHTs, discuss with group the difference between assertiveness and aggressiveness in communication and relationships. Students record information on worksheet 18.

W19 Step 6. Students in mixed gender small groups can demonstrate role plays—they should first practice the three types of interaction suggested and clearly show the difference between each. They should then demonstrate the assertive response for the whole group.
• During the assertiveness role plays demonstrated for the whole group, a selected small group should provide *written feedback* regarding the elements of communication listed on *worksheet 19*. Remind them that their feedback should be specific and form the basis for improved performance next time—that is, it is not sufficient to declare every performance ‘good’ or ‘great’ without saying why.

**LIST OF ITEMS FOR SPACE WALK ACTIVITY**
- Oxygen bottles
- matches
- food
- tent
- torch
- map
- radio transmitter
- length of rope
- fuel for rocket

**DIAGRAM FOR ART ATTACK**
(or substitute another drawing)

**W20 Complete:**
- Concepts Questionnaire
- Evaluation Form
- Attitude Scale

*You may wish to distribute the certificate of completion provided.*
Role plays:

Assertiveness v. aggression

1. During a recess break at school a fight breaks out in the playground between two younger students. You step in to separate the two but the teacher on duty sends all three of you to detention. At the end of recess the teacher comes to tell you that you are all on detention for a week. How can you assertively discuss the situation with the teacher?

   Role play  
   1. an aggressive response  
   2. a passive response  
   3. an assertive response

2. You have recently purchased an expensive pair of running shoes, but after only two weeks of light wear they have begun to fray. You return them to the shop and ask to see the manager and to return the shoes for exchange or refund. The shop assistant blames misuse and overuse for the damage. How can you assertively discuss the matter with the sales assistant or manager?

   Role play  
   1. an aggressive attempt  
   2. a passive attempt  
   3. an assertive attempt
3. You have a new part-time job at Happy Macs after school three days a week. You are the youngest on staff and are employed to make Buffaloburgers, to wait on tables and serve customers etc. However, when the boss is not there one older employee continually asks you to run errands for her—take clothing to the dry cleaners, drop a prescription into the chemist, wash her car etc. How can you assertively deal with this situation?

   Role play
   1. an aggressive approach
   2. a passive approach
   3. an assertive response

4. You have lent your CD player to a friend for use at his party, which you are unable to attend. A week after the party he still has not returned it and one of his other friends tells you that your friend is bragging about his ‘new CD player’ and many people are convinced it is his. How can you assertively deal with this situation?

   Role play
   1. an aggressive approach
   2. a passive response
   3. an assertive approach

5. You are not a very competent computer operator/woodworker/cook and the classes in this subject are made more difficult by a teacher who continually criticises and embarrasses you for your ‘slowness’, ‘clumsiness’ and ‘stupidity’. How can you assertively deal with this person?

   Role play
   1. an aggressive response
   2. a passive response
   3. an assertive approach
Use this recording sheet to determine whether students have acquired the concepts and information contained in the curriculum. For those who have only partially demonstrated the knowledge and skills involved, some revision of particular issues and concepts may be necessary.

**Key:**
- **c** = completely acquired
- **p** = partially acquired
- **n** = not acquired

**Name:** _______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT, KNOWLEDGE, SKILL</th>
<th>ACQUISITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module 1**

1.1 Differentiates real from fantasy violence in viewing
1.2 Defines violence with reference to real hurt or harm
1.3 Identifies broad categories and types of violence
1.4 Can give examples of family, community, national and international violence

**Module 2**

2.1 Knows statistical information related to violence in society:
   - male involvement
   - female involvement
   - children as victims
2.2 Illustrates appropriate categorisation of violence using media
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### Module 3

1. Defines the indicators of violence related to:
   - physiology
   - emotions
   - behaviour

2. Recognises differences in ways of relating to others during conflict

### Module 4

1. Understands the role of choice in violence
2. Identifies gender differences in the experience of violence in society
3. Discusses own experiences and impressions of violence
4. Defines specific legal terms related to violence, including:
   - self-defence
   - manslaughter
   - homicide
   - rape
5. Demonstrates knowledge of the criminal consequences of violence

### Module 5

1. Understands the issues related to violence viewing
2. Demonstrates an understanding of the negative social attitudes which underlie violence, including:
   - sexism
   - racism
   - bullying
   - homophobia
   - revenge
3. Gives examples of appropriate alternative behaviours for avoiding violence

### Module 6

1. Demonstrates an understanding of the antecedents to violence
2. Explains the behaviours which indicate violence
3. Identifies the consequences which may reinforce violence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 7</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Identifies appropriate responses to violence including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- flight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- help-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Can differentiate ‘dobbing’ from legitimate reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Gives examples of appropriate responses in various situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 8</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Identifies relationships which are personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Identifies relationships which are professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Discusses the types of violence which may occur in relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Demonstrates through role-play appropriate attitudes to violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 9</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Discusses non-violent alternatives to conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Researches help agencies available to those at risk of violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Contacts help agency to clarify services and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 10</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Demonstrates through role-play various methods of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Understands the difference between:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- assertiveness and aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- passivity and assertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 Identifies the goals of assertiveness in terms of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4 Understands the assertiveness continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I

### List of Worksheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 1</th>
<th>Worksheet 1</th>
<th>Real or fantasy violence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>Worksheet 2</td>
<td>Definitions and types of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>Worksheet 3</td>
<td>Categories of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Statistical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>Worksheet 4</td>
<td>Indicators of violence (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>Worksheet 5</td>
<td>Indicators of violence (behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Worksheet 6</td>
<td>‘Relating to others’ scale (4 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Worksheet 7</td>
<td>Self-viewing survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Worksheet 8</td>
<td>Gender differences in violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Worksheet 9</td>
<td>Survey of friends' viewing choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td>Worksheet 10</td>
<td>Origins of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Behavioural choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td>Worksheet 11</td>
<td>Recording A-B-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td>Worksheet 12</td>
<td>Preventing violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Feedback sheet A-B-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 7</td>
<td>Worksheet 13</td>
<td>Responding to violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Record key responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 7</td>
<td>Worksheet 14</td>
<td>Violence in relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 8</td>
<td>Worksheet 15</td>
<td>Types of interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 9</td>
<td>Worksheet 16</td>
<td>Non-violent responses to conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 9</td>
<td>Worksheet 17</td>
<td>Seeking help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Help-line record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 10</td>
<td>Worksheet 18</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– What is assertiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Assertiveness continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 10</td>
<td>Worksheet 19</td>
<td>Feedback sheet on assertiveness role plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 10</td>
<td>Worksheet 20</td>
<td>Evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Resolving Violence Through Education

anti-violence curriculum

Certificate of Completion

awarded to

for successful participation

SIGNED           DATED
DEFINITIONS

AGGRESSION:

‘Intention to hurt or emerge superior to others without necessarily involving physical injury’  (Siann, 1988)

VIOLENCE:

‘Use of great force or physical intensity’  (Siann, 1988)

ASSAULT (LEGAL DEFINITION):

‘Any behaviour that presents a clear and immediate threat of physical injury’  (Smith, P., 1983)

(Does not include verbal abuse)

(Does not include property)

BULLYING:

‘Bullying is long-standing physical or psychological violence conducted by an individual or group against another individual’  (Byrne, 1994)
**VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY—STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with Violence</td>
<td>3.0% of incidents reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>1.0% of incidents reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>20.0% of incidents reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Disputes</td>
<td>11.5% of incidents reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (NSW)</td>
<td>1.5% per 100 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Combination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males Murdering Males</td>
<td>60% of murders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males Murdering Females</td>
<td>40% of murders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males Murdering Children</td>
<td>43% of murders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females Murdering Children</td>
<td>56% of murders (Usually infanticide)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children are most at risk from people known to them—often including their mothers, fathers or stepfathers.

Sources


VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY—STATISTICS

HOW OFTEN DO MURDERS OCCUR?

Australia 2 per 100 000 people
Great Britain 0.7 per 100 000 people
USA 10 per 100 000 people
El Salvador 36 per 100 000 people

SERIOUS ASSAULT (AUSTRALIA)

1974 — 20 per 100 000 reported
1987 — 80 per 100 000 reported

39% of NSW murders occur in Central Sydney

ARE WE A VIOLENT SOCIETY?
VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY—STATISTICS

MURDER VICTIMS
60% are males
40% are females
17% are under 5 years of age
22% are aged 15-19 years

OFFENDERS
80-85% are males
15% are females

OF THE MALE OFFENDERS
17% are aged 10-19 years
20% are aged 20-24 years
CHILDREN AS VICTIMS

49% of children murdered are under 1 year of age

68% of children who are murdered are murdered by their own father or mother

8.7% of all murder victims are children (0-16 years)
VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY—STATISTICS

WEAPONS USED

IN AUSTRALIA  Guns used in 35% of murders
               Knives used in 21% of murders
               Bashing used in 23% of murders

IN USA  270 000 students carry guns to school each year.

In 1992  9% of year 8 students
         10% of year 10 students
         6% of year 12 students claimed they carried a gun to school

In 1990  71 people shot at school
         65 students
         6 teachers
PREDICTING VIOLENCE

What happens to the body during conflict?
EFFECTS OF SUBSTANCES

• Drugs and alcohol can depress the central nervous system and inhibit control.

• Drugs and alcohol can affect judgement and ability to respond quickly.

• Drugs and alcohol do not cause violence but are often a factor in violent incidents.
ASSERTIVENESS IN COMMUNICATION

Being able to communicate assertively takes practice. Sometimes we are too aggressive or passive in the way we try to communicate our needs to others...

AGGRESSIVE AUTHORITARIAN DOMINEERING
Aggressive communication is often loud, abusive, bullying and demanding. The intention is to force the other person to do as you say, and sometimes threats are used to ensure that they comply. Aggressive communication shows that one person wants to dominate the other rather than discuss the situation.

ASSERTIVE DEMOCRATIC CONFIDENT
Assertive communication is strong, effective and truthful. The assertive person tries to be honest, to discuss problems in a non-abusive way, and to express what they want clearly. The other person is given a chance to be heard and an effort is used to find a solution using ‘give and take’.

PASSIVE UNDECIDED SUBMISSIVE
Passive communication is weak and ineffective. The intention is to avoid conflict but, because the passive person has not stated clearly what they want in a strong manner, the other person may well ignore their request. Sometimes lies or half-truths are used to avoid discussing problems or difficulties.

This is known as a continuum:

AGGRESSIVE ASSERTIVE PASSIVE
We need to aim for the middle in our communication with others.
WHAT DOES ASSERTIVENESS MEAN?

ASSERTIVENESS MEANS BEING ABLE TO ASK FOR WHAT YOU WANT WITHOUT DEMANDING OR APOLOGISING

ASSERTIVENESS MEANS BEING ABLE TO SAY 'NO' TO SOMETHING YOU DO NOT WANT

ASSERTIVENESS MEANS BEING ABLE TO TELL OTHERS HOW YOU FEEL AND WHAT YOU BELIEVE
What does an assertive person try to do?

1. An assertive person tries to make change happen through discussion and reason—not threats or anger or tantrums or punishment.

2. An assertive person tries to communicate and discuss problems, not blame or abuse the other person.

3. An assertive person tries to make a relationship more equal by letting the other person express their needs and feelings, and by working out an agreement which is acceptable to both parties.

4. An assertive person tries to control their desire to get their own way in every situation, and to always be ‘right’.
ASSERTIVE COMMUNICATION GUIDELINES

WHEN FACED WITH A PROBLEM INVOLVING THE BEHAVIOUR OF ANOTHER PERSON:

1. Approach the person in a friendly manner—being assertive does not mean acting ‘tough’.

2. Ask if you could speak with them and mention the problem or concern.
   (E.g. ‘Jim, could I please talk to you about the team selections?’)

3. Describe briefly the behaviour or decision that you are concerned about.
   (E.g. ‘I am concerned that I have been selected as the ballboy and not the team captain.’)

4. Explain how this affects you.
   (E.g. ‘This does not give me the opportunity to lead the team and actually play in the football game.’)

5. State what you would prefer.
   (E.g. ‘I would prefer to be the captain of the under-21s even though I am only 12.’)

6. Say how this will be an advantage for you both.
   (E.g. ‘This way I will get many more years practice at first grade football and you will be seen as a kind and generous manager.’)

DON’T ALWAYS EXPECT TO GET WHAT YOU ASK FOR—BUT IF YOU NEVER ASK YOU’LL NEVER GET!
ASSERTIVE COMMUNICATION GUIDELINES

WHEN YOU NEED TO DISCUSS A PERSONAL COMPLAINT

1. Use an assertive tone of voice which is calm, clear, friendly and fluent
   No shouting or abuse (aggressive)
   No whining or pleading (passive)
   (E.g. ‘Bill, I would like to discuss my new office with you.’)

2. Rehearsal is good preparation for such a discussion—tell yourself about this complaint before you tell the person concerned.
   (E.g. ‘BILL! There is no way I am going to work in the cleaner’s storeroom, and I’m going to beat up the person who suggested it!’)
   [this is perhaps a little aggressive]
   or
   (E.g. ‘Bill, please don’t make me work in the cleaner’s storeroom. I’ll do anything. Please, please...’)
   [this is perhaps a little passive]
   Can you suggest a more appropriate way of introducing the topic?

3. Use assertive posture
   Stand, sit or walk in a controlled and natural manner
   No tough posturing (relax shoulders, keep a reasonable distance)
   No slouching or fidgeting or avoiding eye contact
4. Be specific and concentrate on this one complaint
Discuss only the problem you have decided to make a complaint about (e.g. your new office).
Don't confuse this issue with any others you may be concerned about. You can deal with them at another time.
Try to discuss this problem without blame, anger or abuse.

5. Don't put the complaint off—be decisive
Now that you have decided to make the complaint, decide when and where you will bring it to the attention of the other person.
Delaying the discussion can make the problem seem worse for you, and less important to the other person (after all, if it was that important, wouldn't you have mentioned it sooner?).
You will have to discuss it eventually if you are to become more assertive—don't avoid the issue.

6. Winning is not the goal
You do not have to 'win' every time you make a complaint or express your dissatisfaction with circumstances, but you will become a more assertive and confident person if you decide to discuss problems rather than ignore them or become angry.

The goals of assertive communication include:
• communicating your needs and feelings
• finding something to agree on—or at least a compromise
• dealing with problems without using violence and abuse in verbal and non-verbal ways
VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION

The way we communicate involves our whole person, not just the words we use.

Think about these aspects of your manner when communicating with others.

VERBAL

Words chosen
• saying 'you' a lot makes it seem as though you are blaming the other person—use 'I' messages more often
• use words that are not offensive to the other person—in particular avoid words which can be interpreted as racist, sexist or personally hurtful
• remember what it is you are discussing and do not include irrelevant messages—FIGHT FAIR!

Tone and pitch of voice
• use a normal tone of voice—not hostile, angry or accusing
• there is no need to shout—you can get your message across with a firm tone which sounds controlled and serious

Listen to your message
• are you blaming? abusing? or complaining? If so you need to try to find a neutral way to get your complaint across

NON-VERBAL

Eye-contact—looking at the other person is a more effective way of getting your message across to them

Physical messages—standing too close can seem threatening; using a tough posture can also intimidate people—stay relaxed
Keep gestures to a minimum—don't point
LEGAL DEFINITIONS
FOR VIOLENT ACTS

SELF-DEFENCE:

• violence is sometimes used in circumstances which are claimed to be 'self-defence'
• legally, this claim can only be made when the person using violence is acting in defence of themselves, and uses only reasonable force

MANSLAUGHTER:

• a violent act which causes the death of another person can be deemed to be either voluntary or involuntary manslaughter
• voluntary manslaughter involves acts of murder for which certain mitigating circumstances can be claimed such as provocation, diminished responsibility or survival of a suicide pact

  PENALTY: IMPRISONMENT

RAPE:

• having sexual intercourse with a female person without her consent is rape including such an act when the female person is asleep, drunk, drugged or otherwise unable to give consent
• females cannot be convicted of rape
• husbands can now be convicted of rape within marriage
• males can be raped by males and this is an offence

  PENALTY: IMPRISONMENT
ILLEGAL INTERCOURSE:

- refers to sexual intercourse with a minor, that is a child up to the age of 16 years. Used to be called ‘carnal knowledge’
- the minimum age of consent is 16 years for males and females in most states
- adults in positions of responsibility, e.g. a teacher, can be legally charged with this offence even if the victim is older than the minimum age

**PENALTY:**
- **VICTIM 0-10 YEARS—MAXIMUM LIFE IMPRISONMENT**
- **VICTIM 10-16 YEARS—IMPRISONMENT**

MURDER:

- the deliberate and unlawful killing of another human being
- also includes the intentional infliction of a serious injury which results in death within a year and a day of the act

**PENALTY:** **IMPRISONMENT UP TO LIFE, NO DEATH PENALTY IN AUSTRALIA**

CRIMINAL DAMAGE:

- the destruction of, or deliberate damage to, another person’s property, including vandalism and graffiti

**PENALTY:** **FINES, IMPRISONMENT, PAY DAMAGES, RESTORE ITEM**
OFFENSIVE WEAPONS:

- anyone who carries an offensive weapon in public is breaking the law
- this includes items which they have made themselves to use as weapons, or which could be claimed to be for use as a weapon
- knives, guns, clubs and manufactured weapons are included, as are items such as a broken bottle, bicycle chain, belt, etc., if these are used or are intended for use as a weapon

**PENALTY: FINES, IMPRISONMENT, CONFISCATION**

WOUNDING:

- grievous bodily harm with intent
- malicious wounding
- assault
- each of these offences involves the deliberate use of physical force or threats to use force, with the intention of harming the victim
- assault can also include using threatening gestures to frighten a victim (e.g. a raised fist, pointing a gun)

**PENALTY: 5 YEARS TO LIFE**

Reference:
Family Guide to Australian Law
Readers' Digest, Sydney
Recent statistics show that young people (10–19 years old) are at greatest risk of violent death in modern society. They are most at risk from each other, and young men are almost twice as likely as young women to meet a violent end.

Serious as this situation might be, teachers and education policy makers are aware that by working with young students, the vast majority of whom are non-violent, a change in attitude can be brought about.

This curriculum — comprising book and student worksheets — has been devised to provide information about violence in our society. As an anti-violence curriculum, it gives young people an opportunity to discuss and reject commonly held beliefs and attitudes about the role of violence in our society. Rejecting violence as an option, and helping students discriminate between violence in the real world from the violence of fantasy, the curriculum encourages students to adopt appropriate non-violent responses to conflict and everyday interactions.

There is a deliberate attempt in the curriculum to address the different experiences of violence of each gender. For young women it reveals how control for survival of violence lies firmly within their own capabilities, through being empowered with help-seeking and assertiveness strategies.

For young men the curriculum clarifies the legal implications for violent behaviours. It demonstrates how necessary a non-violent stance is for young males to move into responsible adulthood. Young men gain from this curriculum insight and empathy for the victims of violence and the results of violent interactions. They are introduced to concepts of assertiveness which suggest that strength and masculinity are not compatible with violence towards others.

This honest, straightforward curriculum attempts to change attitudes through education and to change behaviours through practice.
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GLOSSARY

advocate  to plead in favour of, support or urge by argument
aggression  the practice of making assaults or attacks; an offensive mental attitude
application  the act of putting to a special use or purpose
bullying  a blustering, quarrelsome, overbearing person who browbeats others
component  a constituent part
comprehensive inclusive; of large scope
curricular  regular or particular course of study in a school, college, university
customised  to rebuild or alter so as to make unique
especially weaker and smaller people
evaluation  to ascertain the value or amount of; appraise carefully
intervention  to intercede; to come between in time, place or series
media  forms of electronic communication such as video, television, radio and print
perpetrator  to perform execute r commit a crime or deception
precipitation  to cause the occurrence of event before anticipated; hastening or hurrying
resilience  rebounding; readily recovering
restructuring  to re-organise substantially parts of an organisation
victim  sufferer from any destructive, adverse or injurious action
violence  rough or injurious action or treatment
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ABSTRACT

Violence and bullying in schools have become major issues of concern to teachers, students and parents in the new millennium. As evidence mounts of the destructive, pervasive and sometimes lethal impact of these phenomena within the education milieu, it has become apparent that an approach which comprises a pragmatic intervention informed by innovative theoretical perspectives is urgently required. The body of work presented in this portfolio attempts to address this need by presenting a comprehensive model for intervention in violence and bullying in schools. Based upon the findings of a survey of four Sydney metropolitan schools, and drawing upon extant theory and research, a number of important theoretical perspectives were identified. The proposal that violence may be resolved through education is explored and perceptions about contemporary influences, including the impact of exposure to media violence, are challenged. The conceptualisation of peer abuse as a legislated child protection issue is initiated and discussed. The necessity for the development of resiliency as an individual attribute for victims is examined and the function of peers as formal advocates for victims is proposed.

The identification of the perspectives described above served to underpin the development of a comprehensive model for intervention. The Macarthur Model for Comprehensive and Customised Intervention in Violence and Bullying comprises 6 key components, which structure, guide and facilitate a whole school response. The model is innovative in that it relies upon the data collected at an individual school to inform intervention, and is customised to address the specific concerns and identified needs of the school. The first component involves an investigation of the parameters of violence and bullying in the setting using a survey adapted for use in this research. The instrument yields substantive data related to student perceptions, experiences and attitudes in relation to violence and bullying in the school. The next 5 components of the model are initiated on the basis of the data collected and are applied simultaneously in the educational setting. The second component provides staff development based upon whole school analysis of the data gathered. The third component facilitates the development of school-specific policy related to the impact, types and locations of the violence and bullying reported. The fourth component involves determining the level, focus and application of organisational restructuring required to address issues of student safety and supervision for the
particular setting. The fifth component involves implementing widely applied curricula for the general student population to provide education about origins, indicators and appropriate responses to violence and bullying at school. New approaches are offered in this component including the Peer Advocacy program and a curriculum entitled “Bullybusters”. The sixth component involves addressing the psychological needs of individuals in the bully/victim paradigm, including the acquisition, through training, of personal attributes to facilitate empathy, resistance and resilience. In summary, this portfolio presents a body of scholarly, professional work focused on addressing the issues of violence and bullying in schools through new perspectives and a comprehensive model for intervention that can readily be implemented by educators.
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