Walden University ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection

2017

Staff Member Perceptions of Bullying in an Afterschool Center

Sherrich Monsher Thegg
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Liberal Studies Commons, Other Education Commons, and the Public Administration Commons

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Sherrich Monsher Thegg

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Mary Brown, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Penelope Laws, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Christopher Jones, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Staff Member Perceptions of Bullying in an Afterschool Center

by

Sherrich Monsher Thegg

MA, Savannah State University, 2008

BS, Savannah State University, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

Abstract

Peer-to-peer bullying negatively impacts over 20% of school-aged children annually. While much literature exists on bullying on school premises, peer-to-peer bullying outside of the classroom is still relatively understudied. Despite states' implementation of antibullying legislation, peer-to-peer bullying has continued in schools and other areas such as afterschool centers. The purpose of this qualitative study was to evaluate staff perceptions of peer-to-peer bullying in afterschool centers. It specifically investigated bullying and the hierarchical imbalance of power using Sidanius and Pratto's social dominance theory. The research questions were designed to investigate the staff members' knowledge of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. A phenomenological approach was used and data were collected through one-on-one interviews of 11 Boys and Girls Club staff members. Data from the interviews were deductively coded and subjected to thematic analysis. Findings indicate that staff members do not have a uniform understanding of bullying behaviors, nor did they have a clear guidance on practices to minimize bullying which leads to continued peer-to-peer bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. Staff also reported that they have been offered little training on dealing with bullying behavior, nor are there clear policies in place to combat bullying behavior from participants in the afterschool program. Positive social change may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations to the Boys and Girls Club including mandatory antibullying training for staff and the creation and implementation of a comprehensive antibullying policy.

Staff Member Perceptions of Bullying in an Afterschool Center

by

Sherrich Monsher Thegg

MA, Savannah State University, 2008

BS, Savannah State University, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to professionals who work with youth development in schools, churches, and afterschool centers. Bullying is an epidemic that is taking the lives of children literally and killing them on the inside figuratively. I hope that this work will be useful for youth programming as it relates to preventing and rectifying the issue of bullying among youth. In addition, I hope that policy makers take notice of this research to use as a basis for developing antibullying policies in areas outside of school where children congregate.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to thank God for bringing me this far and allowing me to complete this daunting task. I could not have done this without faith and trust in God that I would see it through. Secondly, I would like to thank my parents who always support me and give me the freedom and love to follow my dreams. I would like to thank my friends who always asked about my progress and let me know that they were proud of me. Thank you, Dr. Brown, for our chats, and your feedback—you would help me see that I can accomplish this task and always reassured me when I had doubts or went too far in the rabbit hole. Thank you to my love, Shine, who always wiped away my frustrations and ensured me that I would finish! I finally did it!!! I am finally Dr. Thegg! Slow and steady wins the race.

Table of Contents

i

iv

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Peer-to-peer bullying in the United States affects 20% of students annually.

Students bully each other physically, verbally, via the Internet, sexually, and socially.

Bullying even leads to suicide amongst youth, which is called bullycide. Despite

antibullying legislation in place, at least 160,000 children take their lives each year

because of being bullied (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2016).

Individuals take on many roles during bullying situations. An individual can act as a

bully, victim, bystander, or bully victim. Teachers can also play the role of bully in

classroom situations.

States take bullying seriously and many states in the United States have

antibullying legislation in place. This antibullying legislation varies from state to state,

but all legislation is applicable to bullying done at schools only (Bernardo, 2015). There

are other places that children congregate besides school, one of those places are

afterschool centers. Afterschool centers are places that children can go after their school

day is over to work on homework, and learn other skills such as character building,

fitness, and education. One of the most well-known afterschool centers is the Boys and

Girls Club.

Founded in 1860, the Boys and Girls Club (2011), then the Boys Club, has a

mission "to enable all young people, especially those who need us most, to reach their

full potential as productive, caring, responsible citizens (para. 3)." The Boys and Girls

Club serves as a place for children to learn and grow in a semi supervised environment

afterschool hours. As a former Boys and Girls Club staff member I witnessed children

bullying each other, and as I became interested in the subject of bullying at afterschool

centers. Throughout the review of literature, I discovered a gap in literature pertaining to

peer-to-peer bullying. The literature revealed much information on peer-to-peer bullying

in the classroom or in a school setting, but not bullying that occurred in other places

where children congregate such as afterschool centers.

This study was designed to explore bullying at the Boys and Girls Club from a

staff perspective. Specifically, this study involved examining the types of bullying that

occurred at the Boys and Girls Club and the policies and training in place to minimize

bullying. In addition, the study involved examining the infraction areas at the Boys and

Girls club where bullying occurred. This chapter includes an overview of peer-to-peer

bullying and the importance of afterschool centers. Lastly, this chapter includes the

purpose of the study, theoretical framework, assumptions, limitation, and significance of

the study.

Background

The objectives of this study were to increase the literature about bullying in

afterschool centers and to address how the lack of knowledge about bullying in

afterschool centers affects antibullying legislation. Currently, the studies researchers such

as Olweus (1993) and Mishna (2003) have done focused on bullying that occurs in

schools. There have been limited studies that focused on the bullying done in other areas

such as afterschool centers, where children frequent. Previous research only focused on

peer-to-peer bullying in schools, resulting in state antibullying legislation that protects

only students bullied on school grounds (source). This original qualitative research determined if bullying was occurring at one afterschool center to provide support to expand the antibullying legislation to include afterschool centers. I used a phenomenological approach to understand the real lived experiences of Boys and Girls Club staff members and the bullying they witnessed by students at the Boys and Girls Club.

How to Deal with the Issue of Bullying

The CDC (2016) defined bullying as "any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths, who are not siblings or current dating partners, involving an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated" (para. 1).

After properly defining bullying, Greene (2006) stated that teachers, parents, and authority figures need to be trained on how to deal with bullying situations in their various settings. The training Greene suggested included four components of classroom management:

- caring attitudes by teachers,
- teaching competence,
- the monitoring of academic work and social relationships, and
- intervention when problems occur (p. 66).

These classroom management techniques allow teachers to be aware of the day-to-day occurrences of their students and put them in a participatory position in the students' lives instead of just that of an authoritative spectator. Because many of the afterschool centers,

such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, are comprised of classroom settings, these classroom management techniques would be applicable there as well.

Mishna (2003), Farrington and Ttofi (2009), and Dragan (2011) suggested that parents, educators, and youth need to receive education on the definition and signs of bullying. Furthermore, these groups need to work together to combat bullying. One example of parents coming together to combat bullying in a uniform manner is National Bullying Prevention Month, which the Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights (PACER) National Bullying Prevention Center started in 2006. The purpose of National Bullying Prevention Month is to "unite, engage and educate communities nationwide to address bullying through creative, relevant and interactive resources" (PACER National Bullying Prevention Center, 2011, para. 1). The PACER Center was founded in 1977 in Minnesota by parents of children with disabilities (PACER National Bullying Prevention Center, 2011). Now the organization helps children and their families through an array of challenges including bullying, not only in Minnesota but across the nation.

In October 2011 during National Bullying Prevention Month, Frank Ski, a radio personality on one of the popular radio stations in Atlanta, interviewed Dr. Tartt, an expert on relationships, youth development, and bullying (Ives, 2011). Dr. Tartt, who has a PhD in clinical psychology from the University of Michigan, spoke about how schools and parents can deal with bullies and stated that school officials can partner with kids who are considered "popular" at school to develop and implement antibullying strategies (Ives, 2011 2011). Tartt also stated that the current culture in American schools is that the student body respects the values, opinions, and trends of the children who are well

known. In the interview, Tartt went further to state that these "popular" children can have a positive impact on antibullying through their peer influence. In addition, Tartt emphasized that bullies need to receive counseling and rehabilitation from professionals (Ives, 2011). Whether this can and will occur with clinical school professionals or clinical professionals outside of the school is another matter. One thing Tartt pointed out was that many of the parents who called in to the radio station had questions about whether to confront a bully or not if that bully was victimizing their child (Ives, 2011). Tartt replied that the answer is no, parents should not confront bullies on behalf of their children; this will most likely cause retaliation from the bully and make the situation worse for the child who must attend school with the bully (Ives, 2011).

Another model that incorporates positive student influence with antibullying strategies is Greene's (2006) model, which puts emphasis on staff member and student effort to combat bullying. At the school level, Greene stated, "antibullying polices, sanctions, and investigatory procedures need to be firmly established and consistently enforced" (p. 67). Using Greene's model, the youth would be held accountable for creating awareness about bullying and proposing initiatives for preventing bullying in their schools through collaboration with staff. This collaboration would be accomplished through a whole-school approach, which includes combined efforts on behalf of the individual, classroom, school, and community to stop and prevent bullying (Greene, 2006, p. 65). According to Greene, individual students contribute to this effort by creating their own antibullying policies and procedures, formulating antibullying campaigns, and creating peer support networks (p. 67). At the classroom level, students

and teachers need to engage in discussions that deal with cultural sensitivity, diversity, and other dynamics associated with bullying. In addition, teachers in the classroom would be responsible for reporting the feedback to officials at the administrative level (Greene, 2006, p. 67). In their 2010 study, Trach, Hymel, Waterhouse, and Neale suggested that peer support systems are a safe space for all parties involved to act against bullying. In elementary schools, the support system is comprised of the buddy system and friendship benches (Trach et al., 2010). In middle schools, peer support groups are demonstrated through peer mentors and mediators who monitor, communicate, and minimize bullying behaviors (Trach et al., 2010).

Lastly, within the community the school has a responsibility to work with parents and neighborhood groups such as youth development organizations and mental health clinics (Greene, 2006). For this approach to be successful, it is essential that authority figures in neighborhood organizations and youth programs are aware of the efforts and strategies schools have made to enforce antibullying. In this context, authority figures include staff who work with children daily who are essential to their growth and development. Using Greene's (2006) model, teachers and other authority figures should complete training that will prepare them for situations involving peer-to-peer bullying. The youth will also be responsible for combating and preventing bullying in their schools. Greene suggested "this sort of participatory problem solving and skill development approach has been shown to be effective in reducing violence within schools" (p. 76). Ockerman, Kramer, and Bruno (2014) suggested that the school, community, and parents had a shared responsibility to work together to eliminate

bullying. These antibullying strategies included: "Engaged principal leadership, a supportive school culture, school and community antibullying training and education and a protective school environment" (p. 3).

Another main component of most of the states' antibullying statutes is employee training. Limber and Small (2003) declared that a provision that mandates bullying prevention training is essential to the antibullying effort because bullying is distinctive and much different from harassment. Currently, 49 states have antibullying laws in place (Bully Police USA, 2015). These states have statues that require information on antibullying laws to be shared and presented in a variety of ways, including workshops, through the office of superintendents of public instruction's website, and through staff member development activities. Websites with antibullying messages must also contain best practices that other schools have used, training materials, and model policies that users can reference and apply to their own school districts (Limber & Small, 2003).

Currently, the legislation in several states surrounding bullying only applies to bullying that occurs in grades Kindergarten through twelve public, private, and charter schools. In response to bullying-related suicides and the increasing number of reports of bullying among youth since 2013, 49 states have instituted bullying laws (Clark, 2013). Although this legislation is an excellent start, it only addresses bullying of youth that occurs at school, on school busses, and at school events. Besides school related antibullying legislation, there is no state or national legislation in place that protects students from bullying in afterschool programs (The Bully Project, 2010; Brown et al, 2002). Children can spend over 4 hours a day at afterschool centers. Although these

afterschool centers provide structure and continued learning for children, they also can provide another venue for children to bully each other.

Afterschool Centers

Afterschool centers are facilities that children attend after the school day is complete. Generally, these centers, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs and YMCA, have programs specifically directed toward youth development components, such as education, character building, recreation, art, and leadership skills. Public/Private Ventures (2012) is a "national nonprofit whose mission is to improve the effectiveness of social programs, particularly those that aim to help young people from high-poverty communities successfully transition to adulthood" (para. 2). Public/Private Ventures conducted a study using a sample of 320 ethnically diverse, low-income youth who attended 10 Boys and Girls afterschool centers across the country. This was a longitudinal study that followed the students from their seventh-grade year up until ninth and tenth grades. This was a mixed-method study that focused on attendance data provided by the club's attendance software and in-depth interviews with a sample of ninth graders. The main purpose of the study was to measure the relationship between club participation and outcomes. This study indicated that teens who had high levels of participation at Boys and Girls Clubs over a 30-month period experienced greater positive change, such as better grades and improved behavior (Public/Private Ventures, 2012). In a study at Fordham University, Eddins (2005) found that participants in the YMCA of Greater New York's Virtual Y programs demonstrated statistically significant and moderate-to-large improvements in task motivation, frustration tolerance, learning skills, acting out, peer social skills,

assertive social skills, shyness/anxiety, and overall behavior (p. 17). These studies indicated that students' participation in afterschool programming resulted in increased academic performance, improved behavior, and healthier socialization skills.

An organization called Afterschool Alliance (2012b) took the initiative of afterschool programming geared towards academics and paired it with antibullying prevention programs (para. 4). The Afterschool Alliance was started in 2000 by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, J.C. Penney Company, Inc., the Open Society Institute/the Afterschool Corporation, the Entertainment Industry Foundation, and the Creative Artists Agency Foundation (Afterschool Alliance, 2012a, para. 4). The organization's focus "is to develop programs that align initiatives emphasized at middle schools, such as bullying prevention and awareness, with programs afterschool centers offer" (Afterschool Alliance, 2011, p. 1). This organization has taken the initiative to provide a resource for afterschool programs that focuses on establishing and maintaining antibullying programs in afterschool centers.

Afterschool centers play an interesting and possibly contradictory role with the cycle of youth bullying. One of the advantages of afterschool centers is that they provide a safe environment where children can have opportunities to build their self-confidence and be free of the pressures to conform that they may experience in a school setting. In addition, afterschool centers can provide a flexible and creative learning environment where youth can effectively learn to deal with bullies (Afterschool Alliance, 2011, para. 2). One of the disadvantages of afterschool centers is that they can serve yet another venue for children to become victims of peer bullying.

Afterschool centers, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, were created in response to statistics that demonstrated unsupervised children engage in gang behaviors, violence, promiscuity, and other inappropriate and dangerous behaviors during the afterschool hours of 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016). In 2002, the New York chapter of Fight Crime: Invest in Kids conducted a survey that found children who are not supervised by an adult during afterschool hours 3 or more days a week were 7 times more likely to become victims of different types of crimes than youth who were supervised during afterschool hours (Gorta, 2002, para. 2). In addition, the survey found teens who were supervised during these same hours were less likely to abuse drugs and commit crimes (Gorta, 2002, para. 10).

Later, the Georgia Afterschool Investment Council Report (2007) noted that over 1 million children are unsupervised between the hours of 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. and for up to 10 weeks during the summer (para. 3). In addition, Afterschool Alliance (2009) reported that 25% of the state's kindergarten to grade twelve population took care of themselves after school with no adult supervision (para. 2). This is due to the lack of afterschool programs in some counties, lack of funding per household to spend on afterschool care, "preference for alternative activities, and lack of interest of child" (Afterschool Alliance, 2009, p. 2). This lack of supervision can create opportunities for youth to engage in criminal activities, promiscuity, and other poor choices.

Afterschool centers are facilities that children attend after the school day is complete. Afterschool Alliance (2009) completed a report called "America after 3 p.m." and stated that about 17% of elementary aged children spend about 8 hours per week in

afterschool programs. In addition, according to the Afterschool Alliance, "87% of parents are satisfied with the afterschool program their child attends" (para. 5). Besides crime, gang activity, and teen pregnancy prevention programs, there were many other long-term negative impacts for youth who are unsupervised from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. Sidorowicz, Hair, and Milot (2009) maintained that afterschool programs keep youth safe and have a positive impact on their self-perception and decision-making while simultaneously improving their behavior inside and outside of school.

Afterschool centers provide a safe environment that gets youth involved in cultural, academic, and recreational activities between the hours of 3 p.m. and 8 p.m., which prevents opportunities for them to engage in criminal and gang activities (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016). McQueen (2010) claimed the time a child spends without adult supervision is risky and can result in harmful events such as injury, substance abuse, and even poor academic performance. Furthermore, McQueen reported that 55% of children under the age of 9 regularly attended supervised care or activities while parents worked; 35% of the older children in the study were usually supervised after school (para. 12). Studies such as McQueen's highlighted former President Clinton's initiative, an initiative that sought $1 billion for afterschool programs for more than 2 million children (McQueen, 2010). In a 2010 ABC News report, Clinton stated that the millions of children that are unsupervised during afterschool hours are in harm's way (McQueen, 2010, para. 9). During his talk, President Clinton highlighted the many benefits of afterschool centers and the fact that they can be an integral part of the bullying solution among youth, especially middle and high school age children (McQueen, 2010).

Many of these programs were initiated and implemented by the 21st Century Community Learning Center program at afterschool centers such as the Boys and Girls Clubs. The 21st Century Community Learning Center Program is a federal government initiative, and as of September 2001, the program had given $1.5 billion to start 6,000 centers in 1,500 communities (Brown, Frates, Rudge, & Tradewell, 2002). Several Boys and Girls Clubs all over the country were recipients of 21st century funds and are the largest provider of afterschool programs (Afterschool Alliance, 2009). Some afterschool centers, such as Boys and Girls Club, utilize 21st century program funding for operational and program costs. This funding could be used for various types of prevention and educational programming.

According to the Afterschool Alliance (2011), one of the primary advantages of afterschool programs is the opportunity for youth to have a one-on-one adult mentoring relationship. This relationship can develop without the restrictions of classroom procedures and the rigid focus on academics found in schools. In addition, afterschool centers provide a sense of community among youth. Through this community, they develop healthy friendships with other youth in an atmosphere of open communication and respect.

Cost Benefits of Afterschool Programming

Programs that serve youth attending afterschool centers are more cost effective than home supervision. According to the Afterschool Alliance (2011), "the return on investment for afterschool programs is, at a minimum, $3 for every $1 invested" (p. 1). Brown et al. (2002) completed a report that analyzed the costs and benefits of having

preventive afterschool programming legislation in place. In their study, they found that every dollar invested in an at-risk child brought a return of $8.92 to $12.90, and the net monetary benefit of each participant is between $79,484 and $119, 427 (Brown et al., 2002, p. 6). The net monetary benefits are reduced child care costs, increased schooling costs, improved academic performance, increased compensation, reduced crime costs, and reduced welfare costs (Brown et al., 2002, p. 6). The area in which the Afterschool and Education Safety Act yielded the highest monetary benefit was reduced crime costs with the range of benefits being $59,425 to $88,835 (Brown et al., 2002, p. 6).

Despite these impressive numbers, many educational institutions and afterschool programs would be more inclined to devote funds to prevention programming if they had the adequate funding to do so (Limber & Small, 2003). Prevention programming, staff training, and funding are all interrelated. Many states would like to mandate staff training for bullying prevention programming as well as training staff members about how to deal with bullies, victims, and bullying, but they are not given the funds to develop these programs. Furthermore, some legislators feel like it is not fair for them to require schools to have bullying prevention programming and bullying prevention training for staff members if the schools are unable to assist with these endeavors (Limber & Small, 2003).

Problem Statement

Through the years, people have accepted bullying as part of adolescence and have perceived teasing and roughhousing as a twisted rite of passage (Hertzog, 2011). According to Hertzog (2011) there have been increasing reports of peer-to-peer bullying, resulting from an individuals' sexual orientation, being the "new kid," or for no

identifiable reason. In some cases, the bully has been identified as a teacher who encourages students in the class to engage in bullying as well (McEvoy, 2005). The main theme in bullying is that the person identified as the bully is stronger or perceived as stronger than the person being bullied (Greene, 2006).

During his address on bullying at the National Bullying Conference held in Washington, DC, President Barack Obama spoke about bullying evolving from a part of growing up to the very thing that threatens adolescents' social development (Superville, 2011). Less visible citizens, including parents of victims, have also come forward and made public statements regarding the bullying their children experienced, especially in the cases where bullying led to suicide. In one case, Sirdeaner Walker's 11-year-old son Carl hanged himself because he could not bear to deal with bullying anymore (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network [GLSEN], 2009). Before the suicide, Walker informed the principal that her son was being bullied. The principal responded that bullying was a normal part of growing up and that the situation would work itself out. Later, in a press conference held on Capitol Hill, Walker stated that school bullying is a problem affecting the entire nation; therefore, the entire nation should try to rectify the problem. She further asserted that policymakers should make antibullying policies in schools mandatory instead of optional (GLSEN, 2009).

Unfortunately, the bullying that Walker's son experienced is a not a new trend in the United States. According to the 2013 Youth Risk Behavior survey, "About 20% of high school students reported being bullied on school property in the 12 months before the survey" (Frieden, Jaffe, Cono, Richards, & Iademarco, 2016, p. 1). In addition, "15%

of high school students reported they have been cyber-bullied in the past 12 months"
(Frieden et al., 2016, p. 1).

Statistics from the CDC (2011a) revealed that "approximately 2.7 million youths,
ages 10 to 18, are bullied each year, and 2.1 million of the 2.7 million victims now take
on the role of the bully" (para. 4). The 2011 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey
revealed that around 20% of students reported being bullied in the last 12 months (Eaton
et al., 2012). In addition, bullying is not confined to adolescence. The effects of bullying
others or being a victim of bullying behaviors can follow individuals into adulthood.
Olweus (1993) found that "60% of boys who bullied their peers during grades 6 to 9 had
at least one criminal conviction by the age of 24" (p. 22). Former bullies are also more
likely to abuse their spouses and use harsher discipline with their children (Theriot,
Dulmus, Sowers, & Bowie, 2004). In response to this cycle of abuse that leads to
violence and bullying, Limber and Small (2003) provided several recommendations for
states about antibullying legislation to support not only the victims of bullying but also
the families of bullies and the bullies themselves.

Today, bullying victims are between 2 to 9 times more likely to consider suicide
than non-victims, according to studies conducted by Yale University (CDC, 2011).
Furthermore, a study in Britain found that at least half (78) of the 176 suicides among
young people in Britain were related to bullying (Dickson, 2010). In the United States,
girls ages 10 to 14 may be at even higher risk for suicide, due to several factors, including
depression related to acts of bullying (CDC, 2011). In 2011 around 1.2 million children
said they had been bullied once a week or more (CDC, 2016). This amount has not

declined since 2005. Out of that 1.2 million, 540,000 students are bullied daily (Robers,

Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2012).

Various artists in cinema and music have told the story of the victims of bullying.

Their productions allow the general population to understand the plight of the bullying

victim. In addition, fiction and nonfiction books have been written to give adult and

youth readers insight into the lives of bullies or their victims. One must wonder about

these artistic creations if life is imitating art or art is imitating life. Bullying has been

depicted in everything from *Girl Wars: 12 Strategies That Will End Female Bullying*, to

movies such as *Diary of a Wimpy Kid* (Filgo et al., 2010) and *Mean Girls* (Michaels,

2004) and even to songs such as Kelly Rowland's "Stole."

"Stole" tells the story of a young person who does not fit into the crowd or

existing school culture and is bullied because he or she is new or different. The lyrics

reflect the life of Jaheem Herrera, who migrated from the U.S. Virgin Islands and was a

new student at Dunaire Elementary where he was bullied because he was new and

considered different (Simon, 2009, para. 3). Bullies called Jaheem "gay" and even

choked him at school. On occasion, he told his mother about the bullying, but that did not

stop the verbal and physical attacks. His mother, Masika Bermudez, reported it to the

school, but the school did not act (Simon, 2009, para.4). On April 16, 2009, Jaheem

Herrera hanged himself at his home after being taunted at school that day by peers who

called him "gay." (Simon, 2009, para. 3). Bermudez stated, "My baby's life has ended

because of this bullying situation the school refused to take care of" (Tresniowski, 2009,

para. 5). In recent years, parents have come forward and demanded that justice be served in relation to their child's suicide or injuries associated with bullying (High, 2007).

Unfortunately, bullying and bully-related suicides are not limited to Kindergarten to twelve grade schools and students. In September 2010, Tyler Clementi, an 18-year-old Rutgers University student, committed suicide by jumping off the George Washington Bridge. He killed himself after his roommate, Dharun Ravi, streamed a live Internet video of him having a sexual encounter with another male (The Tyler Clementi Foundation, 2016, para. 3). Much attention and research on peer-to-peer bullying focuses on bullying that occurs in middle and high schools (Mishna, 2003; Walcott, Upton, Bolen, & Brown, 2008; Williams & Guerra, 2007). Tyler's case, which created national attention because it involved victimization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth, demonstrated that bullying is not confined to the Kindergarten to twelve grade public education system. In January 2011, in response to Clementi's suicide, New Jersey implemented one of the toughest pieces of antibullying legislation in the country (The Tyler Clementi Foundation, 2016, para. 5). This tragedy also gained attention from public figures such as Ellen DeGeneres and President Obama (The Tyler Clementi Foundation, 2016, para. 5).

Recently, Dharun Ravi, the ex-Rutgers student responsible for making Tyler Clementi's sexual encounter public, faced trial. In New Jersey, a crime of that nature is punishable for up to 10 years in prison. However, Ravi received only a 30-day sentence. The main debate was if his action was a prank gone wrong or a hate crime (Hayes, 2012). Furthermore, CNN legal analyst Sunny Hostin stated that this was the first time the

statute involving a hate crime with intent to intimidate had been used in this way. Ravi was not convicted on cyberbullying charges. He was convicted of a hate crime (Cooper, 2012). The lack of a clear definition of bullying may make it difficult for some states to enforce bullying policies. In the example of Dharun Ravi, the courts were classifying Ravi's act toward Clementi as a prank or hate crime, while the media portrayed the incident as cyberbullying. Thus, Ravi received a lesser sentence for a crime listed as a hate crime, when he could have received a more significant sentence if the crime had been classified a different way.

Similarly, in January 2010, Phoebe Prince, a 15-year-old Irish immigrant who migrated to Massachusetts, hanged herself after trying to cope with months of bullying that involved physical and verbal attacks by her peers, including calling her "an Irish slut" (Eckholm, 2011). In addition, one day while walking home from school, bullies threw a sport drink can at Prince (Kennedy, 2010). In September 2011, a 14-year-old high school freshman named Jamey Rodemeyer of Buffalo, New York, committed suicide outside his home after years of being bullied because of his sexual orientation. According to reports from his friends and family, Jamey had sought help from school counselors and teachers about the bullying, yet the bullying continued (James, 2011). In the cases of Jamey Rodemeyer and Jaheem Herrera, the parents spoke to the school regarding the bullying of their children, but the school did not take any action. Thus, both young boys committed suicide, which might have been prevented if the school had taken the allegations more seriously. Both Rodemeyer and Prince were high school freshman who endured physical, verbal, and cyberbullying.

The first chapter will focus on the definitions and examples of various types of bullying that school-aged children experience. In addition, in this chapter I examined the variety of bullying models and will conclude with the purpose of the study and who will benefit from this original research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. This study also explored the type, frequency, and infraction areas of bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. Due to the recent highly publicized suicides involving children that were bullied, some states have enacted antibullying legislation and others have drastically modified the current antibullying legislation they have in place. New Jersey, which passed antibullying legislation in 2002, added another component to their legislation that provided training of public school staff members in the areas of bullying, intimidation, harassment, and suicide prevention (Bullying Statistics, 2009b, para. 4). According to Terry (2010), the main issue with implementing antibullying training in schools is that state policy strongly suggests but does not mandate schools to develop and implement bullying prevention programs (p. 97). Despite state legislation and staff training, very few teachers and school officials have witnessed evident changes in the culture of schools regarding bullies and their victims (Terry, 2010, p. 98).

While legislation may help to protect students in K-12 schools, victims of bullies remain targets in settings outside of these schools (Chandley, 2005). Some local afterschool programs have taken steps to create policies specific to their afterschool centers that prohibit bullying and make children aware of bullying behaviors and what

steps they should take to report these incidents (Chandley, 2005). Many afterschool

programs and centers are aiding in the fight against bullying through programs and

messages that state "aggressive and detrimental behaviors are not something that should

be taken lightly" (Afterschool Alliance, 2011, para. 2). For example, the Boys and Girls

Club advertises messages about bullying awareness on flyers around the afterschool

center to help youth discern when someone is being bullied, and the steps they should

take to address the bullying (I. Whitfield, personal communication, April 18, 2011). The

development of antibullying policies at local afterschool centers are a good start towards

eradicating bullying outside of school grounds. However, the lack of formal

governmental antibullying policies to include afterschool centers allows bullying

perpetrators in these centers to get away with negative behaviors with no consequence

under state and national law. The purpose of this study is to create a new paradigm

related to how legislators view antibullying legislation.

Research Questions

The central research questions for my study are as follows:

RQ1: What are the types of bullying occurring at this Boys and Girls Club? What

policies, trainings and practices are in place to minimize bullying?

RQ2: How can identified "infraction areas" be safer for participants?

Theoretical Framework

While studying the various aspects of peer-to-peer bullying, I came across many

theories that could be used as a framework for the study. The most relatable theory was

social dominance theory (SDT), a theory that synthesizes psychological and sociological

perspectives and focuses on power within hierarchical societies (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999,

p. 22). Over a decade ago, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) claimed that SDT presents a

"multi-level analyses of group-based inequality and oppression by integrating ideas from

personality, political behavior, group based, social identity, and evolutionary psychology

theories" (p. 22). According to Rosenthal and Levy (2010), SDT rests on the premise that

society is hierarchical and comprised of social categories and demographics, including

gender, class, race, age, religion, and sexuality. These hierarchies cause discrimination

against members of disadvantaged groups in various institutions and in their personal

lives.

Social Dominance and Bullying

Limber and Small (2003) stated that the power imbalance between perpetrator and

victim is a critical component of bullying. This component is what differentiates bullying

from regular harassment (e.g., harassment based on gender, religion, and sexual

orientation). Legislators are encouraged to clarify the definition of bullying and highlight

the distinction between bullying and harassment in statutes. Limber and Small went

further to state that harassment laws are limited by action against individuals based on

their race, national origin, sex, and disabilities. Antibullying legislation should "be free of

such limitations" (Limber & Small, 2003, p. 448).

Often children who bully continue with aggressive behavior that leads to future

criminal activity, long-term incarceration, substance abuse, and even death (Greene,

2006). Youth crime-prevention programs are affiliated with antibullying prevention

programs, given that the populations of children who bully are more likely to engage in deviant behavior in their adulthood.

Conceptual Framework

In the literature, one of the most well-known and experimentally effective antibullying programs is the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP). Olweus is recognized as the pioneer of antibullying studies (Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, 2011, para 2). There are many antibullying programs that have emerged throughout the years, but the OBPP is the most well-known and regarded as the most effective. Various schools from around the country have implemented the OBPP, and bullying has decreased in these school systems (Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, 2011, para. 1). The OBPP has demonstrated to school officials and students that if they conduct a pre-assessment, implement an antibullying program, and then measure the outcomes of the program, they will find decreases in bullying incidents among school age children (Olweus, 2005).

For this research, I examined the OBPP. My research questions were similar and aligned with questions asked on the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire and teacher survey. The goals of the OBPP are the same core beliefs of the Boys and Girls Club, which are to provide young people with a safe place to learn and grow (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016). This qualitative research involved examining bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. Peer-to-peer bullying is a significant public health issue and a threat to the growth and safety of youth. Through this research, I sought to gain the perspective of bullying from a staff member perspective via one-on-one interviews so that the results may provide

insight to combat bullying at the Boys and Girl Club. The main gap in literature was that the OBPP has proven to decrease bullying in a school setting, but the program has yet to be applied in an afterschool center context. A more detailed explanation of the OBPP will be discussed in Chapter 2.

Nature of the Study

The nature of this exploratory study involved a qualitative approach and phenomenological theory design to gain information regarding bullying in one afterschool center. Much research has been conducted on peer-on-peer bullying in school settings, yet very little research has focused on bullying in afterschool centers. A research design that would allow for the collection of data demonstrated in one component of the Olweus model was significant along with thorough data analysis.

The methodology included one-on-one interviews with Boys and Girls Club staff who assented to the research with signed consent forms. The interviews with each staff member took place in person. Interview dialogue was transcribed thoroughly and accurately. Staff member interviews took place privately in the executive director's office. I did not use qualitative software to analyze the data because I felt that I could transcribe the data correctly. The procedures used to collect and analyze the data conform to standards set to protect human subjects. This research identified the types of bullying that occurred in an afterschool center, the types of policies and trainings in place to minimize bullying, and identified infraction areas at the afterschool enter where bullying occurred the most.

Definition of Terms

Bullycide: Bullycide is defined as physical, cyber or verbal bullying that is so tormenting that it causes the victim to commit suicide (High, 2007).

Bullying: A form of youth violence which includes "unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths that involves an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times" (CDC, 2016, para. 1).

Cyberbullying: Cyberbullying consists of bullying over the Internet in chat rooms, on social networks, and through text messages (Williams & Guerra, 2007).

Physical bullying: Physical bullying mainly consists of hitting, pushing, kicking or any physical threat one individual demonstrates towards another (Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005).

Sexual bullying: Sexual bullying consists of sexual name-calling, spreading rumors that are sexual in nature, and circulating inappoproraite sexual content whether it be via social media, text, or paper (PACER National Bullying Prevention Center, 2015).

Social bullying: Social bullying includes "spreading rumors, exclusion from a group, and positioning someone to take the blame for something they did not do" (Dragan, 2011, p. 73).

Verbal bullying: Verbal bullying is the use of verbal or written taunting and teasing to humiliate or embarrass an individual (Georgia Department of Education, 2011).

Assumptions

This research was based on several assumptions. The first was that all participants who were invited to participate in the study would accept. Secondly, I assumed all participants would consent to participate in the research. Thirdly, I assumed that each staff member would answer the interview questions truthfully. Next, I assumed that bullying would be found at the Boys and Girls Club due to the lack of supervision and structure that some afterschool centers have. The last assumption was that afterschool centers have limited staff to monitor children and this results is infraction areas not being supervised frequently. This lack of supervision and limited staff results in increased opportunities for bullies to bully their peers.

Scope and Delimitations

Peer-to-peer bullying occurs in areas outside of the classroom. However, previous literature primarily focused on bullying on school grounds. Thus, I decided to examine bullying at an afterschool center instead of a classroom setting. This research specifically focused on infraction areas and how these areas can be safer for participants. In addition, this research looks at the type of bullying that occurs at afterschool centers and what policies and trainings are in place to minimize bullying.

I established transferability in this research by creating a clear protocol that listed steps to conduct the research so that another researcher could duplicate. Yin (2011) suggested that to demonstrate transferability a researcher should also develop a formal database so that another researcher could review findings. I established this formal database for future researchers wanting to duplicate this qualitative research.

Limitations

The limitations of this research include limits with design, sample size, and methodology. The first limitation was qualitative data based on participants' experiences. Because the research focused on lived experiences, the quantitative method was not utilized. This research was also limited to analysis of one afterschool center instead of a multisite setting to compare antibullying programs, trainings, and policies. Secondly, the research only had staff participants and did not include any youth participants. This smaller, one population sample size was a limitation to the research.

Thirdly, this research was conducted in one region of the United States instead of multiple regions to compare the data for similar trends. In addition, methodological limitations of qualitative research included the following: the small sample population available for this study and the many interpretations that this research yielded. As this research was self-conducted, there were limitations on financial and time resources that prevented extensive research including more afterschool centers. To address the limitations, I ensured the research was thorough, valid, reliable, and could be replicated for future researchers.

Significance

There has been limited research on peer-to-peer bullying in areas outside of schools. The contribution of significant data regarding bullying outside of school settings is necessary to fill the gap in literature regarding evidence-based research for bullying in afterschool centers. Second, I envisioned that the results of this research may have an influence on the expansion of antibullying legislation to include venues such as

afterschool centers. This will begin dialogue about public policy expansion so that laws that apply to bullying in schools will also apply to settings outside of the school. This has social implications for bullying prevention, reduction in bullycides, and a possible reduction in incarceration.

There have been several stories of youth who have committed suicide due to constant bullying by their peers. Suicide rates are "continuing to grow among adolescents, and have grown" (CDC, 2011b, para. 3). Cohen and Piquero (2009) maintained that state legislators would be more willing to support bullying prevention programs if they understood that prevention programming is more cost effective than incarceration. In their research, Cohen and Piquero suggested that the monetary value of saving a youth from incarceration through prevention programming is $1.7 to $2.3 million annually, in contrast to the $36 million it costs to incarcerate the same individual. The research rests on the premise that if potential criminal offenders can be identified early through prevention programming, their likelihood for criminal activity will be prevented or diminished. Examining this research would provide relevant data to support expansion of the antibullying legislation to include punishment for bullies and support for victims, bullies, and their families regarding bullying that occurs at afterschool centers.

<div align="center">**Summary**</div>

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. In summary, this research is a valuable resource for afterschool programs that think bullying does not occur at their afterschool center. These centers can utilize the data from this research to create or strengthen their antibullying programs. In regards to the

state's legislation on bullying, legislation does not address bullying in places where children congregate such as afterschool centers. This qualitative research was designed to explore peer-to-peer bullying behaviors at one Boys and Girls Club afterschool center. The hope is that this research will provide information to support a movement mandating afterschool centers to have an antibullying policy in place. In addition, this research was designed to yield information for policy makers to support an expansion of the antibullying legislation to include afterschool centers.

Chapter 1 included a brief overview of the research. Research has shown that peer-to-peer bullying is prominent in afterschool centers; however, there is a gap in research about the bullying that occurs outside of the school settings. Bullying is a growing phenomenon with about 20% of youth bullied annually. Bullying continues throughout the years with over 160,000 children missing school each day because they are afraid they will be physically, verbally, or even cyber bullied (CDC, 2016, para. 4).

In Chapter 2, I will support the expansion of antibullying policies to include afterschool centers through a review of the literature regarding antibullying legislation. Chapter 2 will include the literature search strategy, theoretical foundation, conceptual framework, and literature review.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. This chapter will examine the extant literature about peer-to-peer bullying, primarily with youth in the middle school and high school ages. The literature includes many concepts associated with bullying, such as the definitions of bullying and the challenges of establishing one concrete definition, the types and categories of bullying, bullying and aggression, long-term effects of bullying, and antibullying legislation. Furthermore, this chapter will explore literature on various antibullying frameworks, bullying in K-12 schools related to gender, teacher bullying, and the bullying of LGBTQ youth. Lastly, in this chapter I discuss literature about bullying in afterschool centers, benefits of afterschool centers, bullying-prevention programs, and SDT and how these concepts support antibullying legislation for afterschool centers.

Most of the research on bullying has focused on bullying that occurs at public schools; there is limited research about bullying of youth at afterschool centers such as Boys and Girls Clubs and YMCAs. This gap in the research could help explain why there is no formal governmental legislation that protects students from acts of bullying at afterschool centers. An examination of the literature regarding the definition and types of bullying, bullying in schools, benefits of afterschool centers, and bullying in afterschool centers would provide support for the need for an expansion of antibullying legislation to include afterschool centers.

One of the main concerns with eradicating bullying in the United States is the lack of a uniform definition of bullying that applies to schools and youth-development afterschool programs. Some states provide a formal definition of bullying that relates to their existing antibullying legislation (Bully Police USA, 2015). However, each state has a different idea of what constitutes bullying, and some states include more components within the definition of bullying than do others (Bully Police USA, 2015). To support the expansion of antibullying legislation to include afterschool centers, it is necessary first to examine what the legislation says about bullying. The current legislation regarding bullying at the state level covers bullying that occurs in public schools for kindergarten through grade 12 (Bernardo, 2015; Clark 2013). States' antibullying legislation looks at bullying that occurs in classrooms, on school grounds, and at bus stops (Bully Police USA, 2015). One theme that has remained consistent with the definition of bullying is that there are three main types of bullying: physical, verbal, and cyber (Mishna, 2003; Walcott et al., 2008; Williams & Guerra, 2007).

According to Theriot et al. (2004), there are many definitions of bullying, but the definition most commonly referred to is from Olweus (1993). Olweus defined bullying as a student being victimized repeatedly over time by another student or group of students (p. 173). Olweus further stated that for bullying to occur, an atmosphere of imbalance of power in the peer relationship or an asymmetric power relationship must exist. Additional definitions of bullying include Kolbert, Crothers, and Field (2006), who defined bullying as a "situation in which a person of greater power repeatedly displays aggression towards another to display their domination" (p. 82).

Literature Search Strategy

The literature review process included a thorough search of databases. This search involved examining scholarly and professional literature and selected word choices were used to examine previous works. The scholarly databases used in the search included EBSCOHOST, ERIC, JSTOR, ProQuest, PsycINFO, SocINDEX, and SAGE publications. Much of the literature review was completed using the Walden University database of scholarly literature. The following key search terms and combination of search terms were used: *peer-to-peer bullying*, *afterschool center*, *youth violence*, *Olweus Bullying model*, *bullying in school*, *bullying in afterschool*, *gender and bullying*, *school grade and bullying*, *crime and bullying*, *antibullying models*, and *antibullying legislation.*

Theoretical Framework

Sidanius and Pratto (1999) claimed that SDT presents a "multi-level analyses of group-based inequality and oppression by integrating ideas from personality, political behavior, group based, social identity, and evolutionary psychology theories" (p. 22). According to Rosenthal and Levy (2010), society is comprised of hierarchies and these hierarchies cause discrimination against members of disadvantaged groups in various institutions and in their personal lives.

Social dominance and bullying. SDT related to the research questions and study approach for this qualitative study. When applied to the phenomenon of bullying, SDT emphasized that bullying behavior in childhood can lead to criminal activity in adulthood. This exploratory study focused on bullying done in the understudied area of afterschool centers. The research questions inquired about infraction areas where bullying

occurred and the policies and trainings in place to minimize bullying behaviors. Besides

the physical and psychological benefits of bullying reduction, there is a cost-benefit of

eliminating bullying for crime prevention, according to Cohen and Piquero (2009).

Cohen and Piqueros's research highlighted the idea that a small number of criminal

offenders engaged in the largest amount of criminal activity. The study rests on the

premise that if potential criminal offenders can be identified early, their chances of

criminal activity will be reduced.

Cohen and Piquero (2009) estimated that the monetary value of having saved a

high-risk youth is $1.7 to $2.3 million, as opposed to the $36 million it costs to punish or

incarcerate. If the population of children who bully is like the population of kids who are

at risk for adult criminal activity, then it would be cost-effective for the government to

develop and enforce bullying-prevention programs in accordance with existing

legislation. As I stated earlier, some states have antibullying legislation in place

pertaining to basic mandates of antibullying, such as the advertisement of "no tolerance"

bullying policies on websites and printed material, but no policies for enforcing this

legislation on the program level, especially in sites such as schools and youth

development facilities.

Juvonen, Graham, and Schuster (2003) applied SDT to examine about 2,000

middle school students across 11 schools; their study demonstrated that bullies are

embraced and reinforced by their peers while bully victims are excluded and unpopular.

In this research, being cool and aggressive dominance were highly linked (Juvonen et al.,

2003). Later research revealed that when individuals who were bullies as children grew

up to be adults, they got favorable work evaluations, were perceived as dominant and powerful by their peers, and could easily ascend the corporate ladder (Silverman, 2013).

SDT was applicable because my research involved examining peer-to-peer bullying in afterschool centers. Bullying involves real or perceived aggression and an imbalance of power between one person (bully) and another person(s) also called bully victim (CDC, 2016). The research questions for this research focused on the types of bullying and infraction areas where bullying occurs at one afterschool center. In addition, the research questions inquired about trainings, policies, and practices in place to minimize bullying. These research questions built on existing theory and studies that supported that bullying is a component of real or perceived dominance and the affects that dominance has on bullies and bully victims.

Conceptual Framework

Per Hertz, Donato, and Wright (2013), peer-to-peer bullying is a significant public health problem. Despite research, antibullying laws, and programs to combat bullying, bullying has remained prevalent among youth and continued to get worse. About 20% to 56% of children are bullied annually (Bernardo, 2015, para. 4). In the literature, one of the most well-known and experimentally effective antibullying programs is the OBPP. Scholars have recognized Olweus as the pioneer of antibullying research. There are many antibullying programs that have emerged throughout the years, but the OBPP is the most well-known and regarded as the most effective (OBPP, 2011, para. 1).

Various schools from around the country have implemented the OBPP, and bullying has decreased in these school systems (OBPP, 2011, para. 2). The OBPP has

34

demonstrated to school officials and students that if they conduct a pre-assessment,

implement an antibullying program, and then measure the outcomes of the program, they

will find decreases in bullying incidents among school age children (OBPP, 2011, para.

3). The main gap in literature here is the recurring gap throughout this research: The

OBPP has proven to decrease bullying in a school setting, but the program has yet to be

applied in an afterschool center context.

Challenges with Defining Bullying

One of the most challenging aspects of bullying is the lack of uniformity on its

definition. Although researchers have offered many definitions for bullying, one

consistent theme has been that bullying is a national epidemic that has worsened over the

years (Limber & Small, 2003; Mouttapa, Valente, Rohrbach, Unger, & Valente, 2004). In

their research, Limber and Small (2003) suggested administrators may confuse bullying

with harassment where many districts already have an antiharassment policy. Limber and

Small went further to state that bullying and harassment are very distinct from each other

in reference to training staff on how to deal with the two. Limber and Small believed that

bullying is its own separate phenomenon, and they feared that bullying would be

confused with harassment. As a result, they maintained, strategies to combat this problem

would be ineffective because bullying differs from harassment. However, some

researchers have found that the definitions of bullying and harassment can overlap (Elias

& Zinsd, 2003). The only distinction Elias and Zinsd (2003) made between bullying and

harassment is when the peer harassment is of a sexual nature. Later, Weddle and New

(2011) referred to harassment as bullying. Often the court cases that researchers cited

used the term *harassment* and not *bullying*. This interchange of words feeds the challenge of defining bullying in schools and distinguishing between bullying and harassment. Despite the difficulties of defining bullying and some researchers' attempts to make a distinction between bullying and harassment, certain themes have been consistent in regards to the various types of bullying an individual can experience.

Types of Bullying

According to the National Education Association (as cited in Murphy, 2015), over 160,000 children miss school each day because they are afraid they will be physically, verbally, or even cyber bullied. In this section, various types of peer-to-peer bullying will be discussed, ranging from physical bullying, which includes hitting and pushing, to bullycide, which is suicide that is a result of bullying behaviors.

Physical Bullying

Research conducted by Walcott et al. (2008) on 203 seventh graders revealed that prior to the year 2000, boys were more responsible for physical bullying and aggressors were perceived to have a lower social status by their peers (p. 550). Walcott et al. further stated that overt forms of physical bullying include hitting, pushing, kicking, or verbally threatening a peer. In 2011, Dragan also found that boys did more physical bullying, while girls engaged in verbal bullying by spreading rumors. Although 3 years apart, when these studies are compared, it is evident that young boys engage in physical bullying more often than girls. In accordance with previous studies, research by Zweig, Dank, Lachman, and Yahner (2013) also demonstrated that male youth were the victims of bullying more than their female counterparts.

Verbal Bullying

Mishna (2003) stated that often verbal bullying is the first act prior to the physical bullying and violence that occur amongst youth (p. 518). Verbal bullying includes repeated acts of abuse between peers that vary in actual or perceived power that is administered through words (Mishna, 2003; Williams & Guerra, 2007). Verbal bullying includes taunting with mean words one time or repeatedly over time and can also include spreading nasty rumors. Olweus (1993) stated that verbal bullying is the most prevalent, followed by physical bullying, and lastly cyberbullying. In 2011, that order had changed with bullycide because of cyber and physical bullying being more prevalent followed by verbal bullying (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). In 2014, the order had altered once again with physical bullying less prevalent than verbal, cyber, and social bullying (Ockerman et al., 2014). This change of order throughout the years could be attributed to the fact that at the time of Olweus's research, the Internet was not as prevalent as it is today. According to Messias, Kindrick, and Castro (2014), cyberbullying was the highest amongst female students and did not show a trend of decreasing through high school. This result differed from previous literature suggesting that bullying decreased in high school (Mouttapa et al., 2004).

Cyberbullying

Research has shown that youth are using the Internet to communicate in positive and negative ways. Social networking sites allow youth to make friends over a digital arena where they may be more comfortable than with face-to-face interaction. One of the downsides of electronic communication is that people who use it for harm can remain

anonymous and are not reprimanded for the wrong they do. Many times, this is because

individuals can create fake profiles with electronic media, particularly on social

networking sites such as Facebook. These profiles can hide the identity of the perpetrator.

Cyberbullying or "electronic aggression" is the term that defines all violence that occurs

through electronic venues (CDC, 2011a). Research conducted by Zweig et al. (2013)

revealed that 17% of youth reported being victims of cyberbullying. In terms of gender,

girls were more likely to be victims of cyberbullying than boys. In addition, LGBTQ

youth reported being bullied more than their heterosexual counterparts.

Cyberbullying can take many forms such as outing, slut-shaming, and trolling.

Outing occurs when a bully publishes a peer's personal information on social media or

the internet. The personal information can be a personal phone number, address, or

photos. This information allows other bullies to contact the victim directly to continue the

cyberbullying. This makes the bullying very hard to escape because an individual cannot

just log off a social media site to escape this vicious bullying. (PACER National Bullying

Prevention Center, 2015). The second form of cyberbullying *is slut-shaming*. Some

public figures such as Amber Rose and Monica Lewinski have brought awareness to the

phenomenon. In a talk in March 2015, Lewinsky called for an end to cyberbullying and

slut-shaming and talked about her experience prior to the age of social media. Lewinsky

said she was branded as a tramp, bimbo, and whore and the comments were so

detrimental that her mother feared she would attempt to hurt herself (Alexander, 2015)

Lewinsky further stated that the current social media had created a "culture of

humiliation" characterized by relentless bullying, and that hacking, trolling, and social

harassment were creations of society to which people have become numb and thus do

nothing to stop it (Alexander, 2015). Slut-shaming victims are called derogatory names

like slut, whore, tramp and a slew of other terms to their faces, on social media, and in

group chats and text messages. This type of cyberbullying resembles a type of bullying

on the rise called *sexual bullying* which will be discussed later in this chapter (PACER

National Bullying Prevention Center, 2015). The last form of cyberbullying is called

trolling or masquerading. This form of bullying involves bullies creating fake social

media profiles (names and pictures) so that their identities are protected while they send

hateful bullying messages to their peers. These individuals are called *trollers* and they

also bully by sending pictures and videos to their victims.

Williams and Guerra (2007) defined cyberbullying as the willful use of the

Internet as a technological medium through which harm or discomfort is intentionally and

repeatedly inflicted through indirect aggression that targets a specific person or group of

persons. (p. S15). Some statements posted on public websites and social networks could

provoke children who are being bullied by their peers to end their own lives. "JAMIE IS

STUPID, GAY, FAT ANND [sic] UGLY. HE MUST DIE!" one post stated, according to

local reports (James, 2011, para. 3). Another read, "I wouldn't care if you died. No one

would. So just die it would make everyone WAY happier!" (James, 2011, para. 3). This

is what a child might read minutes before he or she takes his or her own life. These

comments were posted to a website that allowed anonymous posts and encompassed

some of the cyberbullying 14-year-old Jamey Rodemeyer endured daily before taking his

life on September 18, 2011. In July 19, 2013, a 15-year-old homosexual male teenager

from Oregon named Jadin Bell attempted suicide as an escape from constant cyber and physical bullying he experienced because of his sexual orientation. Bell's attempted suicide resulted in brain damage and he was later taken off life support and died.

Mikami, Szwedo, Allen, Evans, and Hare (2010) stated, "online communication may be negatively correlated with adjustment problems, because socially competent youths treat the online environment as yet another place in which to interact with existing friends and broaden their social circle" (p. 46). Cyberbullies consist of two types of individuals: *social climbers* and *aggressive harassers*. Social climbers use the Internet to denigrate those they consider inferior while using bullying to fit in with a crowd. Aggressive harassers have been bullied by others and begin to harass peers as a means of retaliation (Willard, 2007). According to the CDC (2011b) in 2007, about 4% of youth ages 12 to 18 reported being cyberbullied during the school year. In 2009, 20% of high school students reported being bullied on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Nickerson, a licensed psychologist and an expert in school crisis prevention and intervention with an emphasis on violence and bullying, defined cyber-bullying as "using technology (computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices) to willfully harass, threaten, intimidate or otherwise inflict harm" (University of Buffalo, 2011, para. 8). Nickerson further stated that cyberbullying could have the same detrimental effects as traditional bullying (physical bullying) such as "depression, anger, sadness and fear of going to school" (University of Buffalo, 2011, para. 9). The main difference between cyberbullying and physical bullying is that cyberbullying is anonymous and not a

respecter of persons in terms of geographical distance (University of Buffalo, 2011).

Nickerson made recommendations to tackle the issue of cyberbullying and suggested that

parents model appropriate etiquette and respect while using technology. Some more finite

methods are parent supervision and awareness of their children's Internet activity and

behavior. Parents can also monitor their children's Internet activity by using "filtering

software and being more aware of passwords and contacts" (University of Buffalo, 2011,

para. 9). Schools can do their part by teaching responsible and respectful behavior

through using various avenues of technology to communicate (University of Buffalo,

2011).

According to the PACER National Bullying Prevention Center (2015), students

use different social media sites more than others to cyberbully their peers. In a survey of

over 10,000 youth, 75% of youth reported that they used Facebook to bully, 66% utilized

YouTube, and 43% used Twitter for cyberbullying. Lastly, Instagram is used 24% of the

time for cyberbullying behaviors (PACER National Bullying Prevention Center, 2015).

Students who cyber bully are not respecters of status, gender, or race. An example was

when Zelda Williams, daughter of the late Robin Williams, took to Twitter to express her

hurt over the suicide of her father. She was met with harassing, mean-spirited messages

and cyberbullying about Robin Williams' suicide. The vice president of Twitter released

a statement saying that "Twitter did not condone such harassment" however, the

cyberbullying continued (No Bullying, 2015c). Cyberbullying is difficult to control

because bullies can get online anywhere in the world and share and send pictures, videos,

and hateful messages to their victims.

Social Bullying

Dragan (2011) identified a fourth form of bullying that he referred to as *social bullying* (p. 71). Past theorists did not differentiate social bullying from other types of bullying. They just combined it with verbal bullying (Dellesaga & Adamshik, 2005; Mishna, 2003). According to Dragan, social bullying involves groups and the relationships that the youth have within those groups (p. 73). Social bullying could include "spreading rumors, exclusion from a group, and positioning someone to take the blame for something they did not do" (p. 73). In 1995, Crick and Grotpeter defined this as *relational aggression*. This will be expounded on later in this chapter. The definitions of verbal and social bullying appear similar, but the main difference is that social bullying involves exclusion from a group and the spread of rumors while verbal bullying is mainly taunting and teasing.

Bullycide

Bullycide is a term used to describe suicide as the result of bullying (Bullying Statistics, 2009d, para. 4). Kiriakidism (2008) stated, "suicide is the third leading cause of death in youths between the ages of 10 and 24" (p. 216). Compared to those who were not bullied, offenders who were bullied in police custody were 9.22 times more likely to attempt suicide. In later years, a report by the CDC (2011) stated that suicide is the leading cause of death for children ages 14 and younger. There have been several stories about youth who committed suicide due to constant bullying by their peers, and suicide rates are "continuing to grow among adolescents and have grown more than 50% in the past 30 years" (Bullying Statistics, 2009a, para. 3).

Sexual Bullying

A new type of bullying behavior is called *sexual bullying*. This type of bullying is a breeding ground for sexual assault, rape, or other sexual misconduct. Sexual bullying consists of sexual name-calling, spreading rumors that are sexual in nature, and circulating inappoproraite sexual content whether it be via social media, text, or paper. Sometimes these sitautions result from a failed relationship in which one peer begins to sexually bully the other by sharing sexually explicit nude photos in text messages with others. Other times this sexual bullying reuslts from a student being pressured to have sexual inetrcourse from fear of being bullied by other peers. According to a bullying report from the PACER National Bullying Prevention Center in 2015, "In the United States, 7.3% of high school students surveyed were physically forced to have sexual intercourse (when they did not want to) and 10.3% experienced physical dating violence and lastly 10.4% experienced sexual dating violence" (para. 3). The most extreme form of sexual bullying is sexual assault or rape.

<div align="center">

Categories Associated with Bullying

</div>

Children play different roles in peer-to-peer bullying. A child can be a bully, a victim of bullying, demonstrate both behaviors, or just sit back and watch someone getting bullied.

Bullies

Dellasega and Adamshick (2005) defined typical roles in the scheme of bullying such as aggressor, victim, and bystander (p. 65). In his work with Norwegian students, Olweus (1993) found that 7% of children were bullies and 1.6% were both victims and

bullies. The CDC (2016) reported that bullies exhibit characteristics such as impulsivity (a lack of self-control), strict parenting by caregivers, and acceptance of violence. Many studies included different reasons as to why youth bullied their peers. Dragan (2011) stated that there are three interrelated reasons why youth engaged in bullying behaviors: Bullies have a strong need for power and control, bullies find satisfaction in causing injury or suffering to other students, and bullies are often rewarded in some way, materially or psychologically, for their behavior. Dragan (2011) believed that the commonality with bullies is the desire for power and control over an individual who is perceived as or is weaker than the bully. Bullies execute their power through injury and emotional attacks towards other students. The behavior of the bullies is magnified by peers who act as bystanders and sometimes engage in the bullying behaviors themselves.

Victims

Mouttapa et al. (2004) stated that victims represent about 2 to 10% of the school-age population. *Victims* in this context are defined as individuals who are the targets of aggressive or harmful actions and provide little defense against their aggressors (p. 317). These students are often identified by their timid, sensitive, and quiet mannerisms and characterized by their "reactivity, poor emotional regulation, academic difficulties, peer rejection, and learning difficulties" (Mouttapa et al., 2004, p. 317). Characteristics associated with victims are difficulties socializing, making and keeping friends, low self-esteem or confidence, shy or quiet manner, and lack of aggression or assertiveness (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Shipman (2012) suggested that victims of bullies lose their self-

confidence and socialization skills because their objective changes from making friends to avoiding the bully.

Research from the Bullying Project (2010) stated that there is not an exact formula to determine which children were more likely to be victims of bullying. The Bullying Project reported that victims are random and just "in the wrong place at the wrong time" (para. 7). However, Froeschle, Mayorga, Castillo, and Hargrave (2008) and Farrington and Ttofi (2009) pointed to the idea that victims do display certain characteristics that increase the likelihood of repeated victimization. For example, the children's home life could indicate whether they would exemplify the victim role in school and in afterschool programs. The Bullying Project stated, "Parental abuse or misconduct may leave a child with no knowledge or model of a proper relationship" (para. 8). Because of this lack of a relationship, children have trouble forming social relationships with their peers and tend to keep to themselves. Children who seem less sociable and are considered loners are more likely to be victims of bullying behavior (The Bullying Project, 2010). Like bullies' experience, a lack of family support might create or manifest psychosocial problems in youth (The Bullying Project, 2010).

Dragan (2011) also identified several factors that made some children more prone to victimization than others. Usually children who are shy, timid, and do not make eye contact with others are targets for bullies. In addition, children who are easily upset and respond by crying are more likely to get teased and taunted than children who remain stolid (p. 80). Students who have low self-esteem, are insecure, and are depressed rarely defend themselves from bullies and are less likely to retaliate against bullies (p. 82). Over

the years, researchers have found that the type of children most likely to be bullied appear

weak, shy, or look different than children who seem strong, charismatic, and well-known

by their peers (Dragan, 2011; Froeschle et al., 2008; & Mouttapa et al., 2004). The 2015

PACER National Bullying Prevention Center report identified four characteristics of

victims of bullying: (a) students with weight problems, (b) students with disabilities, (c)

students who belonged to racial or religious minorities, and (d) students who were

LGBTQ or perceived as LGBTQ.

Bully Victims

Proactive or aggressive victims are individuals who are both bullies and victims at

some point in time. Mishna (2003) defined two types of victims, passive or submissive.

Many of these victims report self-isolation in response to bullying, while 1/3 report plans

for getting back at their intimidators. Mishna highlighted that there is limited research on

the impact victimization has on the family. Because bullying usually occurs outside the

home environment, when children confide to their parents that they are being bullied,

many times the parents do not know how to respond (Mishna, 2003). This often causes

stress because the parents cannot effectively handle or stop the bullying. The attitudes

and perceptions of parents, teachers, administrators, and students have a direct

relationship with victimization (Mishna, 2003). Victims' homes are characterized by

higher levels of criticism, less structure in terms of rules, and more child maltreatment

(Holt, Finkehlor, & Kantor, 2009, pp. 42-43). Not surprisingly, research has indicated

that victims who are also bullies often suffer from mental health problems and attain

lower academic achievement (Froeschle et al., 2008). Dragan (2011) supported the claim

that later in adulthood, victims of bullies experience a myriad of "mental health and social difficulties" (p. 113).

The Bullying Project (2010) pointed out the importance for teachers, administrators, adults who work with children, and parents to realize that bullies and victims are sometimes the same person. Research has shown that many times children bully because they are over-compensating for something they lack in one area. For example, a child who is a bully at school might be a victim of verbal or physical abuse at home or outside of school. Dragan (2011) commented that it is difficult for parents to distinguish if their children were victims of bullying because they hide it so well out of embarrassment and fear that their parents will not be able to address it (p. 103). In terms of long-term effects of bullying, Bernardo's 2015 research showed that students who act as a bully or a victim are more likely to experience poverty, academic failure, and are more likely to be terminated from their job in adult years.

Bystanders

Bystanders are a key component to bullying because as blatant observers or passive participants, bystanders can directly or indirectly influence bullying behaviors (Dellasega & Adamshick, 2005, p. 65). Greene (2006) stated that bystanders have an important role in the bullying dynamic, especially seeing that most of the bullying occurs in front of other peers (p. 68). Greene further claimed that bullies are empowered by bystanders who are actively and passively supporting their behaviors. Bystanders who actively support bullying engage in hitting and pushing (physical bullying), name-calling and taunting (verbal bullying), or the spreading of nasty rumors and messages via social

media outlets (cyberbullying). Bystanders passively support bullying by standing by and watching the bully punch the victim or by failing to report incidents of verbal and cyberbullying to an authority figure or teacher.

Trach et al. (2010) revealed that female students intervene less in bullying situations as their grade level increases. Female students who act as bystanders either simply watch the bullying occur, passively tell the bully to stop, help the victim by distracting the bully, or later ask the victim if he or she needs help. This research included information that bullying is a performance and the bystanders are the audience that magnify the bullying behavior and give the bully power. Often, bystanders are afraid that bullies will turn their aggression on them, so the bystanders refrain from intervention (Cowie, 2014).

Research by Silva, Pereira, Mendonca, Nunes, and Abadio de Oliveira (2013) stated that bystanders in general play three main roles: defend the victim, support the bullies, or observe and do nothing as a neutral party. This research focused on the idea that the basis of bystander behavior is gender specific. For example, boy students' idea of bullying is a means of interacting with peers. In contrast, girl students bully to intentionally hurt one another. In understanding the different genders' perceptions of bullying, intervention strategies that include awareness and reporting can be implemented and targeted towards the bystanders (Silva et al., 2013). If the bystanders are taught to act as a support system and not a perpetuator of bullying, then the bullying climate can be improved.

Aggression

Some forms of aggression can benefit the aggressors by enhancing their social dominance. Gender socialization theory suggested that boys are socialized to be dominant, powerful, and aggressive; boys experience greater social pressure than girls to conform to socially-prescribed gender roles as independent, self-reliant, and tough (Martin, 1995). In 2003, Kimmel and Mahler found that boys are also 4 times more likely to perceive violence as a legitimate way to resolve conflicts, which can be explained by gender-role socialization theory. In 2004, research still supported this idea and Mouttapa et al. (2004) stated that boys report bullying experiences less and instead retaliate against their victims with violence or aggression. Thornberg and Knutsen conducted research in 2011 with 176 Swedish students in 9th grade that revealed that 32% of boy students bullied others to ensure their status as one of the popular kids. Also, these students bullied as a defense mechanism to protect themselves from being bullied by others and appearing tough to the rest of the student body.

Relational Aggression

Crick and Grotpeter (1995) coined the term *relational aggression*, which is aggression with the purpose of damaging a relationship. Crick and Grotpeter distinguished relational aggression as a separate part of the concept of aggression. They claimed relational aggression includes nonphysical harmful acts to a child such as group exclusion and name-calling. With relational aggression, perpetrators use relationships to do harm to their peers through means of exclusion or spreading rumors when the individuals refuse to comply with the group. While physical forms of aggression have

been studied substantially, research on relational forms of aggression has been limited

(Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005). One theme has been consistent: high levels of relational

aggression or indirect bullying are synonymous with popularity but negatively impact

likability among peers. Furthermore, a female is more likely than a male to engage in

relational aggression, and many times this aggression is difficult to detect and is not

reported by youth (Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005).

As youth progressed from middle school to high school, the perception of the

term "popular" changed. In middle school, children who were popular were considered

well-liked, whereas in high school, popular children were having the most influence over

their peers (Dellesaga & Adamshik, 2005). Dellesaga and Adamshik stated that youth

used relational aggression to maintain their dominant, influential position in a group (p.

67). This meant that in middle school and high school, the way that peers perceive each

other could determine the role they played in the bullying process. In addition, the

pressure to maintain popularity could have led to serious outcomes for relational

aggression or nonphysical bullying, such as substance abuse, eating disorders,

delinquency, and low self-esteem (Crick et al., 1995).

Verbal Bullying and Relational Aggression

Verbal bullying is fueled by relational aggression. Dellesaga and Adamshik

(2005) defined relational aggression as nonphysical behavior by one or a group of

students meant to taunt, hurt, or humiliate another student. They listed relational

aggression behaviors such as "gossip, manipulation, intimidation, exclusions, gestures,

ridicule, name calling, cliques, betrayal of confidences, and sending hurtful messages via

text message or computer" (p. 66). Dellasega and Adamshik pointed out that while

physical forms of aggression have been studied, research on relational forms of

aggression is limited. Furthermore, the Girl Scout Research Institute (as cited in

Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005) stated that young girls fear relational aggression more than

physical forms of violence (p. 66). This supported the idea that verbal bullying caused by

relational aggression, although an issue that receives little attention, can negatively

impact youth behavior. According to Cohen and Piquero (2009), young adults who grew

up and engaged in criminal activity could be traced back to the overtly aggressive youth

who engaged in bullying behaviors during and after school.

Proactive and Reactive Aggression

Dodge (1987) categorized aggression into two groups: proactive and reactive.

Proactive aggression was defined as behavior that was targeted toward a certain victim

for obtaining something. A person who engaged in proactive aggression could want to

obtain property, power, or affiliation. Reactive aggression was a result of built up anger

and frustration that bullies took out on their victims. Research has shown that proactive

aggression is the predominately used aggression among youth. Espelage and Swearer

(2003) studied covert or overt aggression. Overt is direct physical aggression, such as

hitting or kicking, while covert aggression requires a third party and includes name-

calling and the spreading of malicious rumors (p. 368).

Gender and Aggression

There were gender-specific findings in research related to aggression. Research

demonstrated that girls engage in relational aggression (also referred to as indirect

aggression) more than boys. Girls accomplish this by "purposeful manipulation" and "damage of peer relationships" (Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005, p. 65). Often, relational aggression or nonphysical aggression is harder to detect among boys. For young girls still trying to formulate their identity, relational aggression could negatively impact their school performance, peer relationships, self-esteem, and physical and mental health (p. 63). Relational aggression is said to impair normal social development in young girls, not only for the victims but also for the aggressors. Girls who continually display relational aggression often grow to believe that this behavior is acceptable and normal (Dellasega & Adamshik, 2005, p. 67).

Mishna (2003) stated that boys are more often victimized than girls through direct aggression. Direct aggression includes pushing, hitting, or kicking, and indirect aggression involves belittlement, name-calling, spreading nasty rumors, and any aggression that is not physical (p. 514). Boys tend to show aggression outside their normal circle of friends; in contrast, girls show aggression both inside and outside their circle of friends. Research by Silva et al. (2013) revealed that society's perception of men displaying power, masculinity, and intimidation is tied to physical bullying. In addition, society view of girls as more passive and feminine is related to verbal and social bullying such as teasing or talking behind someone's back (Silva et al., 2013). Data from the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence revealed that physical aggression is demonstrated primarily by a male-on-male pattern rather than a female-on-female. Female students are more involved in indirect aggression, which involves teasing and spreading rumors about each other (Hamby et al., 2013).

Types of Environments that Breed Bullies

Mishna (2003) pointed out that some home, school, and community environments could breed bullies and foster victimization (p. 517). Mouttapa et al. (2004) claimed that a school environment gave children an opportunity to interact and develop themselves as individuals independent of their parents' influence and watchful eyes. In a school setting, adolescents received support and healthy socialization, but at the same time, they might experience pressure to "live up to the norms of their friendship group" (Mouttapa et al., 2004, p. 316). The culture of friendship networks can encourage many types of unfavorable behaviors such as underage drinking, smoking, drug use, risky sexual behaviors, and even bullying. These "norms" are the negative aspects of what Mouttapa et al. referred to as "friendship networks" (p. 316). Mouttapa et al. added that aggressive friends were associated with lower rates of victimization and non-aggressive friends are associated with higher levels of victimization (p. 327). Research has shown that bullies' homes are characterized by lack of supervision, child maltreatment, and exposure to domestic violence (Holt, Kantor & Finkehlor, 2009, pp. 42-43). An environment that fosters victimization includes "lack of clear rules regarding aggression, minimal involvement with the students, weak staff member cohesion, inadequate supervision, and minimal student and teacher involvement in the decision-making process" (p. 517).

Dragan (2011) highlighted some similar parental or home characteristics that bullies shared. Many bullies have parents who were very lenient and set few limits or rules in the household. In addition, the parents of bullies are characterized as not supervising their children well inside the home or being concerned about their

whereabouts afterschool (Dragan, 2011, p. 78). Dragan discovered that bullies might have "bully role models" inside the home, such as siblings, relatives, and sometimes their own parents (p. 78). The "bully role models" bully others inside the home and outside the home and have an attitude that accepts and promotes disrespect and violence (pp. 78-79).

Thornberg and Knutsen's 2011 research revealed that 32% of bullies bullied their peers because of their own inner flaws. This same research revealed, 16% of students were shown to have bullied others to boost their own self-esteem, while 14% bullied due to family problems at home. A report by No Bullying (2015b) claimed that an environment where there is a lack of warmth or too much or too little discipline could be a breeding ground for a bully. Bullies also might suffer from low self-esteem and feel they appear cool and more popular if they bully another student who is perceived as weak (No Bullying, 2015a).

Byproducts of Bullying

Research has shown that bullying can lead to other negative behaviors once a boy reaches adulthood (Theriot et al., 2004). These behaviors include criminal behavior, spousal abuse, depression, and other mental health and social adjustment disorders. These negative byproducts of bullying hold true regardless of the role the youth played in the bullying process (bully, victim, bully victim, or bystander) (Walcott et al., 2008). Former bullies were also more likely to abuse their spouses and to use harsher discipline with their children (Theriot et al., 2004). In their work, Dake, Price, and Telljohann (2003) found that bullies were more likely to engage in "substance abuse, fighting and violent behavior with others, and minor academic or criminal deviations" (p. 80). The criminal

deviations that result from bullying behavior include school violence and school shootings. In a study of youth school shooters between 1974 and 2000, 71% of the shooters were victims or the targets of bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2003).

Theriot et al. (2004) conducted research that explored the criminal implications associated with acts of school bullying and the vulnerable populations of these children who act as bullies and engage in aggressive bullying behavior at their schools. Their research included 192 students at rural elementary and middle schools. Out of these 192 students, 34 reported having committed a criminal bullying act in a 3-month period. Some of the derivatives of school bullying were "physical aggression, theft of money, and theft and damage to property" (p. 77). Theriot et al. stated that research was evolving that linked school bullying to later delinquency and criminal offenses (p. 77).

Blanco (2008) described her experiences being bullied as a child and stated, "when you ridicule, bully, exclude, or ignore someone on purpose, treat that person as if you wish they did not exist, you are damaging them for life. I know because I still carry scars" (Blanco, 2008, p. 117). Mishna (2003) stated that children who experience bullying or peer victimization have a greater likelihood of dealing with adjustment problems that continue into adulthood. The literature surrounding bullying intervention indicated that programs should target more than just the children and should include the community—adults as well.

Later research showed that 61% of students said they believed students shot others at school because they had been "victims of physical violence at home or at school" (Bullying Statistics, 2009a, para. 2). Cohen and Piquero (2009) pointed out that

adolescents who bully often grew up to be adults who commit criminal offenses.

Furthermore, it was shown that few criminal offenders engage in most the criminal

activity. This criminal activity includes but is not limited to aggravated assault, armed

robbery, drug possession, and even murder. Cohen and Piquero also stated that it costed

taxpayers more to punish criminal offenders than it did to prevent bullying behaviors that

link bullying to adult criminal behavior. This research supported that students who

experienced violence at home or school were more likely to exhibit violent behavior

toward their peers than students who did not experience violence in these areas (Bullying

Statistics, 2009a; Cohen & Piquero, 2009).

Previous research supported current research findings from 2015 research

conducted by Lereya, Copeland, Costello, and Wolke, which revealed that constant

mistreatment by peers could lead to long-term mental health effects such as depression

and anxiety. In addition, the impact of peer-bullying stretches past mental health issues

for students; the schools are also negatively impacted by peer-on-peer bullying. In a 2010

report, the National Association of Secondary School Principals reported "The average

public school could lose $2.3 million in funding due to suspensions, expulsions,

vandalism, alternative placement, and lower attendance" (Phillips, 2010, para. 4).

School Violence Risk Factors

Despite the research carried out on the reasons behind school shootings, there is

not a uniform understanding of the risk factors, especially those displayed among

minorities and immigrants in regards to school shootings and violence. Research done by

Hong, Cho, and Lee (2010) included the possible reasons behind Seung-Hui Cho's

Virginia Tech shootings and the risk factors associated with minority and immigrant

college students that could have increased the likelihood that they committed school

violence of such a magnitude in the future. Bullying might have been the trigger behind

Cho's anger, depression, and lack of social skills. According to a report by MSNBC in

2007, former classmates at Cho's high school, Westfield High School, mocked and

bullied him for his poor English skills as well as his inaudible manner of speaking (High

School Classmates, 2007). Many youths who experienced bullying prior to college have

feelings like Cho, but instead of retaliating with violence, they committed suicide to end

their pain, as mentioned in the previous chapter. Like many victims of bullying, Cho was

depressed and angry. He had been referred to various mental health services but still

found no relief (Hong, Cho, & Lee, 2010).

Another risk factor Cho exhibited was a lack of a parent-child relationship. The

Virginia Tech Review Panel (2007) reported that Cho lacked communication and a

solidified relationship with his parents. His parents recognized that he was distant and

isolated and urged Cho to open to them, but he rarely spoke to them at all. Hong, Cho and

Lee (2010) declared that strong parent-child relationships could be a deterrent factor

against violence (p. 565). In contrast, a negative or neglectful parent-child relationship is

significantly associated with violent and suicidal behaviors among youth (Oh, Park, &

Choi, 2008). One theme of the Virginia Tech shootings that correlated with other

incidences of bullying is the presence of violence and aggression within the student.

Throughout the literature, violence and aggression seemed to stem from a variety of

home and peer-affiliated environments (Bullying Statistics, 2009c). How the student dealt

with bullying victimization depended on the means and frequency of the bullying (verbal, physical, cyber), how the victim expressed that he or she had been bullied, and support the victim received after he or she shared that information (Bullying Statistics, 2009c).

More studies have examined the relationship between parental involvement and the likelihood of bullying behavior among youth. Research by Jeynes (2008) discussed the relationship between parental involvement and the likelihood of children being bullied due to their race in elementary and secondary school years. Also, the effect of parental involvement and academic achievement was examined. For this research, two different samples were used. The first sample consisted of 139 college students, and the second sample consisted of 102 seventh through twelve graders. The overall results of this research were that higher levels of parental involvement were associated with higher academic achievement among youth in grades 7 to twelve, and in college students. In addition, the author found that increased parent involvement decreased the likelihood that a child would be bullied or racially discriminated against in college (Jeynes, 2008). With regards to academic achievement, Mouttapa et al. (2004) found that bullying could also cause victims to perform more poorly academically. Mouttapa et al. and Jeynes' research both supported the claim that bullying and lack of parental involvement can lower the academic progress of a student. Lack of parental involvement inside the home, and bullying at school paired together could result in low self-esteem, poor socialization skills, and violent behavior among youth or toward family members (Jeynes, 2008; Mouttapa et al., 2004).

Bullies and victims had various future risk factors associated with the bullying they administered or experienced. The CDC (2016) reported that victimized youth have a greater likelihood of experiencing mental health problems than non-victimized youth. The mental health problems victims face ranges from depression, anxiety, and poor school adjustment to physical ailments such as headaches. Bullies, on the other hand, have an increased risk of substance abuse, academic challenges, and violence in their adolescent development into adulthood. According to the CDC, out of these two groups, bully victims are at greater risk for mental health and behavior problems than bullies. The CDC recommended that prevention efforts are needed to ensure resources and programs are provided to help support these individuals.

Seeds, Harkness, and Quilty (2010) conducted research that measured 101 (64 girls and 37 boys) clinically depressed and non-depressed adolescents between ages 13 and 18. These children had reported peer bullying and child abuse by their fathers, and the researchers were determining if these factors were associated with lower perceptions of support and belonging within a social network. Seeds et al. found the impact of child abuse by parents and peer-related bullying was a trauma within itself. The combination of parental abuse and peer bullying can have negative, long-lasting effects for youth, including substance abuse and dependence, delinquency, early pregnancy, and school dropout.

Antibullying Legislation

According to Limber and Small (2003), state laws have brought awareness to new initiatives designed to reduce bullying behavior (p. 446). A common theme among many

of the states' statutes on bullying is the requirement of administrators to develop a policy

to prohibit bullying; interestingly, many statutes required, instead of encouraged, states to

develop antibullying policies. For example, Georgia state law required that each board of

education adopt policies, applicable to students in grades 6 to 12, that prohibited bullying

another student (p. 448). Limber and Small suggested that the cause for states not

mandating antibullying policy is that they were conscious of legislating statutes that were

not funded by the state. Theriot et al. (2004) pointed out that recent legislation might be

the beginning of states taking bullying seriously and developing a "formal criminalization

of bullying" (p. 80). Most of the states' legislation included mandates or

recommendations to the school system to post information regarding no tolerance

bullying policies and included the information in a student code book. At the time that

Limber and Small (2003) wrote this article, only one state, West Virginia, included

legislation about the protection of victims from additional bullying. Froeschle et al.,

2008) noted, "state policies cannot alter the existing culture" in regards to bullying (p.

115).

The Sawyer Rosenstein case demonstrated that the existing culture could be more

influential than state policy. After a 6-year-long case, a New Jersey school district had to

pay Sawyer Rosenstein a $4.2 million settlement after a well-known bully punched him

in the abdomen at school on May 16, 2006. The punch resulted in paralysis and was a

culmination of several physical attacks of bullying against Sawyer (Huffington Post,

2012). The bully who physically assaulted Sawyer Rosenstein had punched another

student earlier in the year, and according to reports, had a history of violence towards

other students. Sawyer's parents sued the New Jersey school district for not complying

with the New Jersey antibullying law because there were no reports of bullying and no

discipline for the bully. Also, 3 months prior to the punch that paralyzed Sawyer, he e-

mailed school staff to inform them of bullying and ask them for help. In the e-mail,

Sawyer stated that he was being bullied and wanted to make the school officials aware of

the bullying to serve as documentation in case the situation happened again (Huffington

Post, 2012). In this example, although New Jersey has a strict state law, the existing

school culture was more prevalent than the state policy, which conflicted with the school

culture, and thus led to a hefty settlement and justice for the Rosensteins (Huffington

Post, 2012).

Despite increased youth suicide associated with various types of bullying, some

educators, while concurring that bullying is a serious issue, do not necessarily agree with

legislation forcing schools to take action against it. One superintendent reported that his

teachers already had enough bureaucratic procedures to deal with, and he did not have

time to chase down a bully and write a report when he should be out in the hallways

(Dorning, 2009). It was difficult to gauge if school districts had started to take bullying

more seriously. Regardless of the state laws in 2009 and 2012, it seemed that some

educators did not take peer-to-peer bullying seriously because superintendents did not

make enforcing bullying legislation a priority (AP, 2012; Dorning, 2009).

Kueny and Zirkel (2012) suggested that there was a gap between antibullying

legislation and methods used by teachers to eliminate bullying in their classrooms. The

teachers argued that antibullying legislation was not effective at eliminating bullying

because these laws focused more on the components of bullying (definition, and policy) versus how staff should have responded to bullying (reporting, investigation, and consequences). Many states failed to not only provide funding to implement these antibullying programs, but also failed to provide evidence-based standards and best practices for the teachers to model their responses to bullying in the classroom.

Various States' Antibullying Legislation

As of March 2015, 50 states had antibullying laws in place, the last state to adopt these laws was Montana (Bully Police USA, 2015). The laws required schools to address bullying in their school policy documents (Clark, 2013). Not all of these antibullying laws demanded criminal consequences for bullying. Out of the 50 states, 5 states did not have a provision for legal action for bullies while 12 states had criminal consequences for bullies such as school suspension and even jail time (Clark, 2013).

Under the lead of State Senator Barbara Buono, New Jersey adopted its antibullying legislation in 2002; however, this initial legislation encouraged but did not mandate the presence of antibullying programs in Kindergarten to twelve grade public schools (Simmons, 2010). After the 2010 suicide of Rutgers University student Tyler Clementi, the state of New Jersey took a more assertive stance on antibullying legislation. The current legislation, known as the "Antibullying Bill of Rights," was said to be the toughest piece of antibullying legislation in the United States and was inaugurated under the administration of Governor Chris Christie (Cohen, 2011). In response to Clementi's suicide and with a prioritized approach to bullying, the New Jersey legislation was modified and required antibullying programs to be present in public Kindergarten to

twelve grade schools and verbiage in college codes of conduct that addressed bullying (Simmons, 2010). Some states also began to take bullycide among LGBTQ youth seriously and modified legislation to propel antibullying prevention efforts. The State of California implemented a law called Seth's Law, the objective of which was to crack down on bullying of LGBTQ students (Hibbard, 2011). Although California led the way in terms of implementing antibullying legislation that protected LGBTQ students, many other states also began improving or modifying their legislation to address the bullycide of LGBTQ youth.

Missouri legislation. Both Missouri's and the District of Columbia's antibullying legislation recognized cyberbullying as a form of bullying that would not be tolerated (Simmons, 2010). Although Missouri was doing its part to protect youth from cyberbullying, according to Weddle and New (2011), this protection was not extended to LGBTQ youth. In Missouri, conservative Christians led by Representative Jane Cunningham protested that that antibullying legislation was truly a guise used by gay advocates who wished to promote LGBTQ agendas in America's school systems. These conservative Christians were successful in impacting legislation so that no mention of sexual orientation was made in the antibullying legislation or in school bullying prevention programs. The sentiment of the conservatives was "Policies shall treat students equally and shall not contain specific lists of protected classes of students who are to receive special treatment" (Weddle & New, 2011, p. 327).

Weddle and New (2011) stated that school officials and legislators who followed this Christian conservatism might violate Title IX and the Equal Protection Clause, as

well as promote negligent supervision theories (p. 329). Due to Cunningham's Christian

Conservative stance, LGBTQ students suffered harassment and bullying at a much higher

rate than did straight students; in fact, 84% of these students reported that they were

verbally bullied (name-calling and teasing) because of their sexual orientation (Weddle &

New, 2011). A 2010 survey found that 61.1% of LGBTQ students reported that they felt

"unsafe" due to their sexual orientation. In addition, teachers failed to stop the gay slurs

toward students less than 16% of the time in schools with an antibullying policy that did

not have a mention of protected groups. In schools where no antibullying policy existed,

teachers intervened only 10% of the time when they heard children using gay slurs

(Weddle & New, 2011).

Georgia legislation. Georgia was the first state (in 1999) to enact antibullying

legislation (Simmons, 2010). Georgia's legislation required the "implementation of a

character education program at all grade levels that were to include methods of

discouraging bullying and violent acts against fellow students" (para. 5). Furthermore, the

verbiage in the legislation was modified to add *razor blade* to the definition of weapon

(Bully Police USA, 2015). The antibullying legislation for Georgia included a concrete

definition of bullying. This state's antibullying legislation left policy formulation in the

hands of state administrators. The advantage of this flexibility is that administrators could

mold the policy to fit their school district's specific needs. The disadvantage is that

administrators are left to use their own interpretations to formulate policy, perhaps

missing vital aspects that characterized the phenomenon of bullying (Georgia Department

of Education, 2011).

Georgia required the state board of education to include "methods of discouraging bullying and violent acts against fellow students" in their Kindergarten to twelve grade character education program (Limber & Small, 2003, p. 450). Furthermore, legislation in Georgia demanded that the Department of Education post antibullying training resources on their website. Although this state was the first state to enact antibullying legislation, it did not take steps to modify that legislation as a solution to the growing problems associated with bullying. For example, there was not a mandate that required school-affiliated community organizations to comply with posting antibullying training resources on their websites or to participate in antibullying training (Georgia Department of Education, 2011).

Legislation modification: Senate Bill 250. On May 27, 2010, Georgia's governor signed Senate Bill 250, a modified antibullying legislation to strengthen existing antibullying laws. This bill revised some of the classifications of prohibited acts regarding public schools (Bully Police USA, 2015). Senate Bill 250 deemed that no later than January 1, 2011, the Department of Education had to develop a model antibullying policy that could be revised from time to time (Bully Police USA, 2015). No later than August 1, 2011, Senate Bill 250 required the local boards of education to ensure that parents were notified of the prohibitions of bullying and the consequences for violating these regulations. The information about bullying as an unlawful act at school was to be posted publically in the schools, and information about antibullying laws was to be provided in student and parent handbooks (Bully Police USA, 2015). Senate Bill 250 also stated that any behavior that was intentional, reckless, and knowingly disrupted the

operation of public schools or public school buses was considered unlawful educational disruption or interference and would be subject to a misdemeanor of a "high and aggravated nature" (Bully Police USA, 2015). Furthermore, Senate Bill 250 expanded the definition of bullying to provide for legislative findings and to allow students to be reassigned to another school if they were being bullied. The purpose of this provision was to separate the student from his or her bullying victim. In addition, the Senate Bill 250 modification included a provision to direct the state Department of Education to develop a model policy (Bully Police USA, 2015).

Senate Bill 250 also changed the manner in which bullies were held responsible for their bullying actions. With Senate Bill 250, if a student in grades 6 to 12 commited an act of bullying for the 3rd time in a school year, the student would be reassigned to an alternative school. However, the new legislation did not address whether the youth could return to his or her original school after a specified time frame. The new antibullying legislation also required parents to be informed every time their child was bullied. If parents felt as though the bullying incidents were not being dealt with accordingly by school officials, then they had the legal authority to sue the school system. Georgia also included consequences for schools not complying with antibullying legislation such as withholding state funding for school programming (Bully Police USA, 2015).

Components of Antibullying Legislation

Limber and Small (2003) note seven common themes and requirements in anti-bullying legislation: (a) employee training, (b) reporting requirements and immunity clauses, (c) disciplinary procedures for perpetrators of bullying, (d) protection of victims

of bullying, (e) improving communication among staff members and students, (f) model

policies, and (g) development and implementation of bullying prevention programs (pp.

449-452). In their work, Limber and Small highlighted what was called legislative

findings, "conclusions reached by the legislature that provided a rationale for the

legislature's actions" (p. 448). Not all state legislation was effective at reducing bullying,

and there was still a question as to whether state laws were useful at reducing the

occurrence of bullying (p. 446).

   Training. Another main component of most of the states' antibullying statutes

was employee *training*. At least five states, including Georgia, require school districts to

receive training on harassment and bullying prevention policies. This statue also required

this information be shared and presented in a variety of ways, including workshops, the

Office of Superintendents of Public Instruction's website, and staff member development

activities (Limber & Small, 2003). The website also needed to contain best practices used

by other schools, training materials, and model policies that the user could reference and

apply to their own school districts. Limber and Small (2003) declared that a provision

that mandated bullying prevention training was essential to the antibullying effort

because bullying was distinctive and much different from harassment. In addition,

bullying needed its own unique training to deal with the various dynamics of the

phenomenon. The fear was that lack of training would result in bullying being associated

with harassment and school officials using ineffective strategies to "treat" the problem, or

not addressing the problem at all (Limber & Small, 2003).

Reporting. Many states included mandatory *reporting* of bullying in their statutes, while others simply encouraged school officials to report an instance of taunting or bullying to the principal, who in turn would inform the superintendent. Limber and Small (2003) highlighted the distinction between encouraging and mandating in that mandating is associated with accountability and a legal responsibility to report by school officials. In response to this, several states included immunity clauses for reporting bullying behavior in their schools. Limber and Small pointed out that reporting alone would not reduce bullying in schools. They suggested that a comprehensive school-wide approach that transformed bullying from a common behavior to one where it is universally unacceptable was the key to reducing bullying (p. 451). A reporting-only mandate could direct attention toward the punishment for bullying rather than the causes and the school environment that bred bullying behaviors.

Punishment. In regards to *punishment* for the bully perpetrators, Limber and Small (2003) stated that Georgia had the most punitive legislation. Georgia's statute stated after the third reported bullying offense, a child in grades 6 to 12 would be assigned to an alternative school. It must be reiterated that this state's law only applied to physical bullying. Limber and Small discouraged this method of punishing bullies. The first reason is that bullying is so common that a great percentage of children would be effected and, in turn, would transition into alternative schools. Secondly, the consequence for bullying was so harsh that it might intimidate children into not reporting bullying for fear of retaliation. Limber and Small stated that children who bully are more likely to engage in other anti-social behaviors such as truancy, fighting, and theft. Furthermore,

students who engaged in such behaviors, including bullying, needed a positive environment that fostered respect, and if authorities removed the students from a positive school environment into an alternative school with other youth delinquents, the opportunity for reform might be lost.

Dragan (2011) stated that after the mass school shooting at Columbine High school, officials began a strict campaign to end bullying. A "zero tolerance policy" was implemented in school systems, and officials thought that implementing this policy alone would eradicate the bullying behavior that was said to have prompted the two shooters to kill their classmates. Dragan stated that other than traumatizing young people by expelling and arresting bullies, the zero tolerance policy had no effect on the children because "punishment alone for bullies is not the solution" (p. 32).

Open communication. The last consistent element in states' legislation dealing with bullying is *open communication* between the staff member and students about bullying. Limber and Small (2003) noted that two states, New York and Rhode Island, have identical language in their statuates regarding strategies for improving communications about bullying with staff members and students. Farrington and Ttofi (2009) stated that the parents of youth performed a vital role to prevent or end bullying. The researchers believed that to encourage youth to report bullying behaviors, parents should attend parent meetings at the school or afterschool facility and develop and maintain a healthy communicative relationship with teachers and staff. Furthermore, parents should observe their children for changes in their behavior such as depression, loss of appetite, and loss of interest in hobbies (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009).

Once the bullying behaviors have begun, the parents should use the existing relationship they have with teachers and staff to discuss the bullying incidents and see what the school had in place to combat bullying. In addition, parents should keep open communication with their children and monitor their activity on social network sites such as Facebook (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009). Dragan (2011) stated that parents need to have open communication with children and know what steps to take to protect their children from bullying or deter their childen from further bullying behaviors. Dragan suggested that forcing a bully to apologize to a victim could almost guarantee that the victim would be tormented again by the bully. However, many parents believe that this method works.

Effectiveness of Antibullying Legislation

Another component of antibullying prevention programming is the argument for cost effectiveness. Olweus (1993), in his famous international bullying research, stated that bullying could lead to other anti-social behaviors among perpetrators. Not all state legislation is effective at reducing bullying, and there is still a question as to whether state laws are useful at reducing the occurrence of bullying (p. 446). The main question now is how effectively does the law influence school policies? Out of the 50 states that have enacted antibullying legislation, only nine really provide a definition of what behaviors constituted bullying. The problem with this is that the definition of bullying is left to be interpreted by school administrators whose definition may not be in accordance with the statutes of legislation. In addition, the evaluation of these antibullying programs are seldom evaluated for effectiveness, validity, and reliability. Farrington and Ttofi (2009)

stated that although various antibullying programs have been implemented worldwide, they are rarely evaluated.

Awarness of antibullying intitaives had progressed past school grounds and state legislation. In October 2006, PACER's National Bullying Prevention Center declared the entire month of October Bullying Prevention Month (PACER National Bullying Prevention Center, 2015). The main purpose of National Bullying Prevention Month was to change society's perception of bullying from a rite of passage for youth to understanding the severity of bullying, and its negative impact through education and support. This event had grown into a month's worth of activites, events, and programs centered around bullying awareness and prevention. Organizations such as the PACER Center, Stomp Out Bullying, and other antibullying awarness organizations provided activites that promoted bullying awarness and encouraged reporting of bullying behaviors to staff or parents. The message these organizations endorsed is that bullying is not cool and can have devastating effects on peers, friends, and loved ones.

Bullying Models

Model Antibullying Statute

The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) prepared a model antibullying statute. This model combined the best practices of existing antibullying laws along with some recommendations to ensure that current legislation was understood in laymen's terms (ADL, 2009). Although some of the state statutes may include all the elements in ADL's model, some do not. The ADL (2009) stated that antibullying policies should be in place before an incident occurs.

Human Rights Framework

The first component of Greene's (2006) human rights framework was the understanding that bullying by nature is a violation of the victim's human rights (p. 70). Greene claimed that infusing a human rights framework into bullying prevention efforts would combat some of the obstacles that hinder the effectiveness of bully prevention programs. Greene believed that bullying must be combated on four levels: individual, classroom, school, and community. Greene identified the key stakeholders of a school-based bullying prevention program as administrators, teachers, students, parents, auxiliary school staff, and community partners (p. 73).

Greene (2006) suggested that a human rights framework and a peace psychology perspective be added to bullying prevention efforts. Greene believed that the issue of bullying in schools is a human rights issue and should be a priority among school administrators. Greene claimed, "Teachers are without doubt the key agents of change regarding adoption and implementation" (p. 76). In this research, Greene identified curricula created by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. This curriculum included detailed lesson plans on bullying and sexual harassment for children from grades kindergarten through high school (p. 75).

Using the model suggested by Greene (2006), teachers would complete a mandatory training to deal with situations involving incidents of bullying. The youth would also be responsible for combating and preventing bullying in their schools through developing antibullying policies and creating peer-support networks. Greene suggested

"this sort of participatory problem solving and skill development approach has been shown to be effective in reducing violence within schools" (p. 76).

Social Work Framework

Literature in the field of social work on the topic of bullying is limited. Mishna (2003) stated that bullying problems are not inclusive of just the bully; bullying included the peer group, classroom, school, and the broader community (p. 513). The author suggested researchers use a comprehensive framework to study bullying. A child's environment directly impacted the experience they had with bullying or peer victimization. Mishna declared that because it was perceived that victims were unable to defend themselves, it is the responsibility of others to intervene. Olweus (1993) stated that boys in grades 6 to 9 who bully were 4 times more likely to be convicted of a crime by age 24 than boys who were bullying victims or boys who did not bully at all.

Children who bully were the students who were most likely unhappy at school (Limber & Small, 2003). These children also tended to be depressed in adulthood and suffered from attention deficit disorders. Research showed that both bullies and victims were more likely to be rejected by peers than youth who did not fall into either of these categories. Many youths did not intervene when they witnessed bullying because they feared retaliation and challenging the bully's power and influence (p. 516). Families of bullies tended to have a home environment riddled with conflict and violence (Olweus, 1993).

Bullying in Schools

In the United States, bullies represented approximately 7% to 15% of the school-aged population. Bullying often led to lower academic achievement, low self-esteem, eating disorders, and other types of dysfunctional behavior among youth, compared to youth who did not experience bullying (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Bullying decreased in high school because children already established social networks and positions. For example, if a student had been labeled as a nerd, then he or she would probably be considered a nerd for the entirety of their high school career.

Natvig (2001) discovered that school alienation contributed to the risk of bullying while support from teachers and peers decreased children's tendency toward bullying. In addition, Crockett (2003) identified that students experienced teasing daily, teachers often ignored physical bullying abuse, and staff members and parents provided little support. Later research demonstrated that training and staff/teacher bullying preparedness decreased the likelihood that bullying would occur because children were aware that there was a "no tolerance" policy in place and there would be immediate consequences for their actions (Dellasega, & Adamshick, 2005). Greene (2006) claimed, "Teachers were without doubt the key agents of change regarding adoption and implementation" (p. 76). Research demonstrated that support and attention from teachers could facilitate the enforcement of antibullying legislation in the schools and, in turn, help decrease instances of bullying (Crockett, 2003; Dellasega, & Adamshick, 2005; Greene, 2006; Natvig, 2001).

Recent studies were in accordance with past literature that demonstrated that support and education from educators and other support groups decreased the likelihood and occurrence of bullying. For example, Leung and To (2009) pointed out that support from teachers, staff, and parents decreased the likelihood that bullying will occur. Holt, Kantor, and Finkelhor (2009) claimed that multiple groups are targeted for prevention efforts, from students to teachers and parents. Many researchers, such as Greene (2006), believed that bullying resulted from lack of parental responsibility and neglect. Leung and To stated that bullying reflected a child's personality, social cognitive development, and social phenomena (p. 34). In addition, children's culture and family upbringing could influence their likelihood of being a bully, victim, or bystander (Leung & To, 2009).

According to Leung and To (2009), some secondary school students could not bear the pressure when faced with examinations and some of them exhibited destructive behaviors such as suicide and bullying. Therefore, cases of school bullying broke out frequently (Leung & To, 2009). However, one of the limitations of research such as this was the research was conducted in one geographic area and not representative of all secondary school students. In addition, a response set bias was present in that children responded to the questions in a socially accepted manner (Leung & To, 2009, p. 40).

Bullying in elementary and high school was a growing problem, not only in the United States, but also in other countries such as Australia, some European nations, and Asian countries. The fact that bullying was an international problem was demonstrated in Leung and To's (2009) research of 200 middle school boys and 140 middle school girls in Hong Kong. The objective of this research was to investigate the relationship between

students' stress and bullying. In Hong Kong, secondary school students faced high levels of stress due to the examination-oriented curricula. Although bullying was a growing problem that teachers and administrators struggle to resolve, Dragan (2011) stated that unfortunately, most school officials had little eagerness to reach out to parents when their children are being bullied. However, school officials preferred to maintain the facade that everything in the school is running smoothly (p. 34).

Gender, Grade Level, and Bullying

Mouttapa et al. (2004) pointed out that bullying varies by gender. Girls bullied by spreading rumors and socially isolating themselves from the victims. Boys bullied physically by kicking, pushing, and even punching their victims (pp. 317-318). Victims also coped with bullying in different ways based on gender; boys were less likely to tell anyone they were bullied and more likely to retaliate against their victims with violence or aggression. Girl victims responded to bullying with helplessness. Dellesaga and Adamshik (2005) stated that girls used non-physical bullying or relational aggression to maintain a dominant, influential position in a group (p. 67).

Leung and To (2009) discovered that stress had a direct relationship with bullying. Leung and To (2009) stated that boys bullied to prove their masculinity through physical bullying, while girls bullied through nonphysical means to maintain their social status. Dragan (2011) stated that boys engaged in and were victims of physical and verbal bullying behavior more frequently than girls.

Bullies and Grade Level

Olweus (1993) stated that bullying is less physical in the higher grades than in the lower grades. In Olweus' Bergen research, the highest rates of bullying were found in 8th grade boys. Girls from elementary through high school were bullied by both genders, while boys reported being bullied by other boys (Olweus, 1993; Williams & Guerra, 2007). The literature still supported that claim; however, now there were more forms of bullying to consider. According to Dragan (2011), face-to-face bullying increased through the years in elementary school, peaked in middle school years, and then declined in high school (pp. 57-58). Dragan added that although physical bullying decreased as children grew older, verbal bullying remained constant regardless of age. In their 2012 research on bullying, Kueny and Zirkel suggested that middle school teachers should have been more informed about antibullying state laws so they could truly understand their role with minimizing bullying in the classroom. The literature supported the idea that bullying peaked in middle school, and therefore middle school programs should have been a primary target of antibullying intervention.

Teacher Bullies

Peer-to-peer bullying and teacher bullying have many similarities. Both forms of bullying are chronic and expressed in front of others. Both are types of humiliation, which could have long-term negative effects on students. Like peer-to-peer bullying, teacher bullying received little reprimand, and there are often bystanders who witnessed the bullying and took no action against it. Often, the classroom was the primary setting for teacher bullying, however, teacher bullying could occur in any setting where children

were required to be under adult supervision, such as afterschool centers and recreational facilities.

Also in comparison to peer-to-peer bullying, teacher bullies selected their victims based on vulnerability and ease of target. Easy targets included protected classes such as religion, race, or sexual orientation. Some teachers who engaged in teacher bullying had justifications for their bullying. They viewed bullying as a form of motivation for the student to perform better or as a needed part of instruction or "tough love" (McEvoy, 2005). Other teachers justified teacher bullying as a disciplinary response toward inappropriate behavior by the student labeled as the target. Often, teachers tried to deflect complaints made by the students they were bullying. For example, a teacher claimed that students protested about bullying due to grades they felt were unfair or because of their low academic performance. Teachers who bullied used these excuses to deflect attention away from the real issues, and that, according to McEvoy (2005), is a "systematic abuse of power" (p. 2).

There were two types of teacher bullies: the power-dominant bully and the power-lax bully (McEvoy, 2005). Power-dominant bullies were teachers who intentionally belittled or humiliated students. Power-lax bullies lacked the skills and ability to manage the classroom effectively, so they did not. An example of a power-lax teacher bully was the repeated bullying of a five-year-old girl named Jazmin Lovings that occurred at a public school in Brooklyn, New York. The first incident was when Jazmin's earrings were stolen, and she was kicked several times by three kindergarten boys in her class. In the months to follow Jazmin was also hit in the face with a lunch box by her peers and

beaten in the bathroom. During the last incident, several bullies in the same kindergarten classroom punched Jazmin repeatedly and cut off her hair (Kolonder, 2010). Two main questions arose regarding the power-lax teacher bully in this incident: How did the children get access to the scissors? What were the teachers doing while the students were brutalizing their classmate for these months (Dragan, 2011)?

Twemlow and Fonagy (2005) stated, "A teacher bully is one who used their power to punish, manipulate, or disparage a student beyond what would be considered a reasonable disciplinary procedure" (p. 2). Psychiatrists Twemlow and Fonagy conducted research to measure the relationship between teacher bullies and student school suspension frequency. These researchers used a convenience sample of 214 teachers and administered an anonymous survey that asked questions about their perceptions of teachers who bullied students and their own practices regarding bullying students. 75% of all teachers in 8 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 3 high schools participated.

Teachers were grouped based on the levels of suspensions that occurred at their schools. The categories of suspensions ranged from low, medium, and high rates. The researchers used analyses of variance, chi square statistics, and categorical variables to analyze the data. The results of the research were that teachers who taught at schools with a high level of student suspensions reported that they bullied students more than teachers who taught at schools with low levels of student suspensions. These teachers also reported they experienced more bullying when they were students and had worked with more teachers who bullied students over the past 3 years. The findings from this research

demonstrated that teachers who bullied students may have a role in the basis of behavioral problems in school-aged children (Twemlow & Fonagy, 2005).

McEvoy (2005) defined bullying by teachers or other staff, such as coaches, as a pattern of conduct, rooted in a power differential, which threatens, harms, humiliates, induces fear, or causes students substantial emotional distress (p. 1). McEvoy conducted research based on focus group discussion with school staff members. Interviews were conducted with 236 respondents about their experiences with high school teachers who they perceived as non-sexual bullies towards students. The research demonstrated that responses to reports of teacher bullying were either ineffective or did not exist. McEvoy stated that teacher bullying undermined the premise of education in our country and "produces a loss of faith in the fairness of the academic institution" (p. 3). Similar to stalking victims, students felt trapped in a situation in which their abuser is all-powerful. Often teacher bullies chose their victims based on some real or perceived physical, behavioral, or intellectual difference.

The research McEvoy (2005) conducted was a fixed choice response and narrative account conducted with a convenience sample of 236 high schools and college age students with an age range of 15 to 23; however, much of the respondents were aged 18 to 21. Key questions guided the interviews and students discussed personal experiences where they felt a teacher had bullied them. Of the 236 respondents, 93% or 219 students replied *yes* when asked, "do you think most students in your high school would agree on which teachers bullied students?" This statistic also correlated with

educator focus groups within the same study who believed that some of their colleagues who bullied students were easily identifiable (McEvoy, 2005, p. 4).

Out of the 219 respondents who answered yes to the first question, 25% reported that there were at least three teacher bullies in their schools; they identified 30% of the teacher bullies as men and 12% as women, and 57% included both genders as teacher bullies (McEvoy, 2005, p. 5). In addition, the 219 respondents reported that 89% of the teachers who engaged in teacher bullying had taught 5 or more years while only 6% had taught less than 5 years, and 6% did not specify. Lastly, when the students were asked if they thought the teachers doing the bullying would get in trouble, 77% said no, the teacher would not get in trouble, and 21% said yes (McEvoy, 2005, p. 6).

Many of the respondents' comments revealed that teachers could bully and get away with it. Usually when an observer entered the classroom to follow up on a teacher bullying complaint, the teacher modified his or her behavior and acted caring and nice toward the students. Also, one respondent reported that seniority played a role. It was the student's word against the teacher's. Another respondent stated that nothing was done about teacher bullying unless the teachers were physically abusive, and that never happened (McEvoy, 2005, pp. 6-7).

Furthermore, respondents were asked if they ever complained about a teacher and the outcome of the complaint. One respondent said the teacher knew the student had complained, and thus the student was afraid to go back to class. Another respondent told the principal about the teacher, and the principal said he or she would consider it but never did. Yet another respondent was told to "live with it" and work it out with the

teacher (McEvoy, 2005, p. 6). According to McEvoy (2005), the main theme of these

accounts by students was how vivid each incident was long after the students graduated

from school and how nothing was done in terms of punishment for the teacher who

bullied them (p. 8).

McEvoy (2005) highlighted that with the lack of formal policies, victims and

bystanders who attempted to report teacher bullying received no support from the school

system. In addition, there was not a system in place that allowed the administration to

deal with grievances made by students about their teachers (p. 10). McEvoy stated that

failure to address complaints of teacher bullying could result in legal implications, even if

there were no policies in place. McEvoy also stated, "much like trends in sexual

harassment lawsuits, it seems plausible that lawsuits against schools based on tolerance

of bullying and denial of redress could be on the horizon" (p. 11).

In 2011, the lawsuits that McEvoy (2005) discussed were illustrated when a more

publicized act of teacher bullying occurred. The mother and long-term boyfriend of a

developmentally-disabled student placed a recording device on the girl to prove the

student was being bullied by her teacher and teacher's aide. In the recording, teacher

Christie Wilt and aide Kelly Chaffins were heard bullying the student about her weight

and made comments about her intelligence and character. The teacher and teacher's aide

were on the tape saying, "are you that damn dumb" and "nobody likes you and that's why

you do not have any friends because you lie, cheat, and steal." In another recording on

another day, the teacher was recorded telling the student she had failed the test before

even grading it. Wilt stated, "you know what just keep it, I know you failed, I do not have

to grade it" (Associated Press, 2011). The girl's guardians said that suspicions of teacher bullying arose several years prior to the recording placed on their child, and school officials did nothing. The guardians sued the teacher, aide, and school district and reached a settlement of $300,000 for emotional and verbal abuse of a child.

Page (2007) identified three elements that form the basis of teacher bullying. First, many teachers who were good students during their school age years cannot comprehend their current students' misbehavior as a cry for help regarding their academic incompetence, boredom, or even problems at home. Second, during the time spent as a teacher, the teacher may not have adequate experience on alternative methods to deal with difficult students. Third, teachers utilized strategies based on erroneous and biased beliefs on reluctant learners (para. 2).

Some teachers believed that withholding praise or approval, teasing, sarcasm, and shame is tough love that motivated children to behave better and increased their academic performance. They did not realize these were the same methods peer bullies used to humiliate and torment their victims. Some teachers believed that bullying (without calling it bullying) was an acceptable form of classroom management and student control (para. 3). Page (2007) stated that although the reasons behind teacher bullying differed from those of peer-to-peer bullying, the long-lasting effects were similar. Some of the environments that breed teacher bullies were school climates where there was an imbalance of power, desire for control, and approval of bystanders or colleagues (para. 15).

Page (2007) declared that because teachers had so much authority in the school system and community, their bullying was more detrimental than peer bullying. Teacher bullies created a climate of hostility and acceptance of bullying of the students in other areas such as in unsupervised areas at school and in afterschool programs and activities. Often teacher bullies "created a bullying monster" or a vulnerable bully victim. Often these students bullied by their teachers match the bullying behavior with their own defiant bullying behavior. They often took on roles such as the class clown, or they disrespected other students inside and out of the classroom. Lastly, looking at the literature on teacher bullying from 2005 until recently, Page supported claims made in McEvoy's (2005) research that former students still suffered shame, anxiety, low self-esteem, and psychological problems from the bullying they experienced from their teachers' years ago.

Research demonstrated that students perceived teachers as authority figures and leaders within the classroom setting (Teaching Tolerance, 2011). So, when teachers engaged in bullying behaviors such as taunting, humiliating, or punishing a student outside of the realms of normal disciplinary action, it sent the wrong message to the other students. This behavior conveyed the message that bullying is tolerated and that the authority figures accepted it.

LGBTQ Bullying

Some of the most recent publicized cases of bullyicide were with the LGBTQ community who fell prey to bullies and commited suicide to cope with constant physical, verbal, and cyberbullying attacks. The well-known antibullying website "Stomp out

bullying" (2011) reported "9 out of 10 LGBTQ students experience harassment at school" (para. 2). One of the first publicized bullycides that involved a LGBTQ student was Tyler Clementi of Rutgers University. Unfortunately, cases like Clementi's were not uncommon. According to the National Climate Survey conducted by GLSEN 2017), the rate of victimization among LGBTQ students remained constant between 1999 and 2015 (para. 3). Furthermore, parents and educators faced challenges with bullying and LGBTQ students at schools where there were little to no resources to support gay-straight alliances (GLSEN, 2017).

LGBTQ bullycide is an epidemic that reached all across the United States (GLSEN, 2017). GLSEN (2017) stated that homosexual youth were 4 times more likely to commit suicide than their heterosexual counterparts. In Anolka-Hennepin school district, which is Minnesota's largest school district, nine teens committed suicide because their were bullied due to their sexual orientation (GLSEN, 2009). In September 2011, a 14-year-old boy named Jamey Rodemeyer took his life after being bullied day after day for more than a year since middle school. According to his parents, the bullying had been reported by teachers and friends of Jamey, but this did not stop the brutality. Jamey even sought the help of school therapists and counselors to resolve the issue. Weeks before his death, Jamey wrote on his Facebook page, "I always say how bullied I am, but no one listens. ... What do I have to do so people will listen to me? No one in my school cares about preventing suicide" (James, 2011). According to Jamey's parents and friends, his suicide came as a shock. They thought he was learning to cope with the bullying internally and outwardly, letting the bullying roll off his shoulders.

Bullies in Afterschool Centers

Afterschool Programs

Afterschool programs were one of the greatest resources for children and families in communities. Crockett (2003) explained that afterschool 1/2 million children were frequently at home alone without supervision which is the time when they were at greatest risk for getting into trouble (Crockett, 2003). McQueen (2010) stated "the time a child spends without the supervision of an adult is risky and can result in injury, substance abuse, and poor academic performance" (McQueen, 2010, para. 12). McQueen (2010) reported, "55% of children 9 and younger were sent regularly to supervised care or activities while parents worked; 35% of the older children in the research were usually supervised afterschool" (para. 12).

Benefits of afterschool programs. Willard (2008) stated that an afterschool center can be a setting in which students could learn about the harmful effects of cyberbullying and how to combat the trend. Willard stated staff members could influence the peers (especially ones who are popular and have influence over the other students) to disapprove of cyberbullying. This was accomplished through the youth members creating rules for the computer lab and creating a computer council so that if a problem with bullying arose, the council was responsible for solving the issue. These types of suggestions empowered students to combat the issue of bullying on their level and influenced the other children to act appropriately.

Short term benefits from afterschool programs. In 2002, researchers found that the hours between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. were the peak hours for youth to engage in crime,

gang, drug, and sexual activity (Fight Crime, 2002). Afterschool centers were said to be

the solution to the problem of youth engaging in these risky behaviors during those hours

(Fight Crime, 2002). Although policy makers were aware of this information, they still

asked, "Do afterschool programs benefit children and have a positive impact on student

achievement" (Afterschool Programs, 2004, para. 6)? Several studies, conducted as early

as 1998 on afterschool programs across the country found major improvements in

academic performance in school districts in New York, Illinois, New Hampshire,

Louisiana, California, Texas, and Tennessee (Afterschool Programs, 2004).

Research conducted by the Afterschool Alliance and their affiliates found that

youth who attended afterschool centers had improved behavior, academic performance,

test scores, and reduced high school dropout rate (Afterschool Alliance, 2011). For

example, research conducted by YMCA USA and reported by Afterschool Alliance

(2011) found that students who did not attend afterschool centers were 3 times more

likely to skip classes than youth who attended these centers. This early research showed

the importance of afterschool centers and their relationship with increased attendance at

school (YMCA USA, 2001). In 2004, research by Policy Studies Associates found that

students who attended afterschool centers had improvements in their math scores. In

addition, high school students who attended afterschool centers passed more Regents Test

exams than students who did not attend afterschool centers (Policy Studies Associates,

2004). Research done for the 2008 to 2009 academic year, one afterschool program in

California found that regular attendance in afterschool programs yielded improvements in

standardized test scores and reductions in behavior issues among youth (University of California at Irvine, 2012).

Recent research demonstrated that children who attended afterschool centers experience improved academic performance and increased homework completion that leads to higher graduation rates. In 2010, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction conducted research that indicated that students who attended afterschool programs improved class participation by 66%, and homework completion also improved by 66% (Afterschool Alliance, 2012a). In 2011, research by Project Exploration found that students who participated in afterschool and summer learning programs graduated at a rate of 95%. In addition, 50% of youth who previously attended afterschool programs enrolled in a four-year college (Project Exploration, 2012).

Long-term benefits of afterschool programs. Afterschool centers also provided long-term benefits that help shape the lives of young people and keep them out of trouble. Keeping youth out of trouble during their adolescence can aid in their academic and professional success in later adult years (Gorta, 2002). The long-term benefits of afterschool centers can be understood by the words of the City of Savannah, GA's Mayor, Otis Johnson: "Our goal is to prepare our children for adulthood. Afterschool is an investment our city government continues to make even in these economic times to ensure that we're moving our children toward our goal" (Georgia Municipal, 2010, para. 2).

Some youth who did not attend afterschool centers and are unsupervised during afterschool hours may end up in trouble with the law and victims of criminal activity or,

even worse, death. The New York Chapter of Fight Crime: Invest in Kids did a survey in 2002 that found "youth who are unsupervised during afterschool hours, three or more days a week are seven times more likely to become crime victims than youth who are supervised during these hours" (Gorta, 2002, para. 4). In addition, the survey found "teens that were supervised during the afterschool hours were less likely to engage in substance abuse and commit crimes" (Gorta, 2002, para. 4). Crockett (2003) reported that 7 1/2million children were at home alone without supervision afterschool when they were at greatest risk for getting into trouble. The literature remained consistent that the peak hours for youth engaged in risky behaviors are between 3p.m. and 6p.m. In addition, research demonstrated the short and long term benefits of afterschool centers related to youth crime prevention, including better behavior, increased class attendance, and increased academic performance, which leads to higher graduation and post-secondary education rates.

The Boys and Girls Club of Metro Atlanta

One of the largest organizations that provided afterschool care and created an atmosphere of safety, self expression, respect, and fun, is the Boys and Girls Club. As of 2009, the Boys and Girls Club was the largest provider of afterschool programs" (Afterschool Alliance, 2009, p. 2). The Boys and Girls Club of Metro Atlanta or (BGCMA) is "a private, nonprofit organization that improves young people's lives as well as the communities that surround and support us" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 5). As a nonprofit organization, BGCMA relies on funding from private companies, corporations, individuals, and the United Way. This funding, in addition to membership

dues, covered the operational expenses for the BGCMA (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 5). The mission of the BGCMA is "To provide a quality developmental program that empowers metro Atlanta youth, especially those from disadvantaged circumstances, to become productive adults" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 1).

The BGCMA has existed for more than 70 years and served as a beacon in the community, working with youth from disadvantaged families and neighborhoods. The BGCMA served more than 5,000 youth ages 6 to 18 daily through programs, instruction, and outreach programs. BGCMA consisted of 26 clubs that are scattered across 11 metro counties, Camp Kiwanis in Danielsville, Georgia, and Youth Art Connection, an art gallery and workspace for young people in downtown Atlanta (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 3). The Clubs are open Monday-Friday from 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. during the hours that children were more susceptible to gangs, violence, and other risky behaviors. The main priority of the BGCMA was to keep children off the street and safe by providing an environment that fostered positive development and a unique blend of instruction and healthy socialization (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016).

The success of the BGCMA is attributed to a number of components, the first being the fact that the clubs were located in areas with the greatest need, where youth development and community outreach programs are limited or non-existent. BGCMA made it feasible for low income families to afford membership by only charging an annual membership fee of $35. However, no child was denied membership if their family cannot afford the membership fee. The next major elements of BGCMA's success is results-oriented programming led by a professional, dedicated staff.

The Boys and Girls Club Programming

The Boys and Girls Club had many different types of programming to keep the children engaged, educate them on life skills, and be a source of fun and positive youth development.

Be Educated program. The various Boys and Girls Clubs offered diverse programming in areas including academic success, healthy lifestyles, and character and leadership development (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 3). The BGCMA's education program (Be Educated) focused on enhanching reading, math and science skills, group and individual tutoring, homework assistance, college and career preparation, and technology resources and curriculum (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 2). The second component of the education programming is arts and cultural enrichment. This programming included "fine arts, digital arts and photography, creative writing, cultural appreciation, fine arts room, art materials, contests, youth art gallery for exhibits, workshops, field trips and art history" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 3).

Be Healthy program. The next program area in the Boys and Girls Club of Metro Atalnta was health lifestyles (Be Healthy). This particular program helped participants "develop fitness, positive use of leisure time, skills for stress management, appreciation for the environment and social skills" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 1). The Health and Nutrition section of this programming involved health, nutrition and overall well-being, gender and age-appropriate programs, basic safety skills and Internet safety, teen-based mentoring, drug/alcohol prevention, and gang resistance training" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 1). The second portion is the sports, physical fitness,

and recreation sections. These programs include daily physical fitness activity, social recreation activities, full gym and game room, intramural leagues, swimming, and outdoor environmental experiences at camps like Camp Kiwanis.

Be Leaders program. The last programming area the Boys and Girls Club of Metro Atlanta provided was character and leadership development (Be Leaders). Dedicated staff members implemented this area by encouraging members to become upstanding citizens who influenced their peers and community in a positive way and who developed a positive self-image and good character while learning to respect the cultural identities of others (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 1). The specific program areas were "teen-leadership programs, age-appropriate leadership clubs, recognition and honors, community service projects, collaborations with community partners, and understanding and appreciation for philanthropy" (The Boys and Girls Club, 2016, para. 2).

Bullying Prevention/Antibullying Programming

Many interventions consisted of involvement on all levels: teachers, staff, students, and parents. These interventions called for a stronger presence in places where bullying occurred, such as hallways between classes and on the playground. Another intervention strategy was to infuse the curriculum with information about problem solving, conflict resolution, and diversity (Mishna, 2003). Based on research of bullying and future criminal behaviors by Dake, Price, and Telljohann (2003), any bullying prevention program should include prevention focused on preventing future criminal involvement (p. 90). Farrington and Ttofi (2009) supported the idea that given the link

between bullying and later offending, effective bullying prevention programs should lead to later reductions in crime (p. 322).

One of the main components of antibullying programs was self-reporting of bullying incidences by victims and bystanders. An advantage of self-reporting was that data could be collected at multiple times during the research to examine behavioral changes as a result of prevention efforts (Espelage & Swearer, 2003, p. 369). In regards to self- reporting, some researchers felt as though the definition of bullying should have been provided so individuals who completed the report understood the definition of the act; others believed that including a definition for the participants may hinder the student from answering the questions truthfully.

Types of Antibullying Programs

Limber and Small (2003) would not recommend that schools limit themselves to implementing only evidence-based antibullying programs because that could hinder the creative development of other antibullying programs (p. 450). Later research showed that schools and community-serving organizations should consider only evidence-based antibullying programs because these programs had yielded better results (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009). Farrington and Ttofi (2009) recommended that policy makers develop and use antibullying programs that had been proven effective, such as the OBPP. In addition, these programs could be slightly modified but only in correlation with proven elements of effectiveness. Farrington and Ttofi suggested that future programs should be theoretical in nature and should reference theories such as defiance theory and restorative justice approaches (p. 324). Although many researchers such as Ttofi and Farrington have

attempted to modify and create original bullying prevention programs, the most evidence-based bullying prevention program referred to in the literature is the OBPP.

OBPP. The OBPP, the world's foremost bullying prevention program, is said to be based on the most research (Farrington, 2009; Greene, 2006). Olweus, who was a psychology professor from Norway, developed the OBPP. Olweus developed the first version of this program after three teens died by suicide in Norway in what was thought to be a response to serious peer bullying. Dr. Olweus did not confine his work to bullying in schools. He wanted to impact legislation to take a hard look at bullying and the devastating impact it had on youth in Sweden and Norway (OBPP, 2011). In the mid-1990s, he began to influence legislation to solve the growing problem of bullying. During this time, Olweus worked with his American colleagues to modify the OBPP (2011) so that it applied in the United States. The primary colleague he worked with on this project was Dr. Susan P. Limber of Clemson University in South Carolina (para. 2). The OBPP should not be misconstrued as a program aimed at the bullies in the school or even just at the bullies and victims. The OBPP is a school wide program implemented at various levels, including the school, classroom, individual students, and the community (Bullying Statistics, 2009c, para. 3).

While initial evaluations of the OBPP were limited to primary students in Bergen, Norway, subsequent studies have verified the effectiveness of the program in a variety of settings. According to Youth Violence (2011), two years after implementing the OBPP, bully victim problems in schools decreased by 50%. In addition, antisocial behavior, such as theft, vandalism, and truancy also dropped during these years, while school climate

improved (Youth Violence, 2011). These changes showed a cause and effect relationship and confirmed that the OBPP is indeed effective. To demonstrate reliability, "multiple replications of this program have demonstrated similar effects in England, Germany, and the United States" (Youth Violence, 2011, para. 2). One of the criticisms of this model was research done by Farrington and Ttofi (2009) that showed minimal reduction in bullying victimization at an experimental high school following implementation of the OBPP. The poor results may be attributed to the length of the research, which was carried out for only one year (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009). When Olweus conducted his research in Norway, he saw a significant reduction in bullying after a two-year application of the program.

Best Practices for Antibullying Programs and Prevention Efforts

The CDC (2016) suggested some basic best practice prevention steps that could be applied to any bullying prevention program, whether the program was administered in schools or in the community. One of the overall best practices was that authority figures supervised children during "high frequency socialization times whether in person or monitoring their Internet activity" (CDC, 2016, para. 5). The second-best practice was to have a structure in place that included concrete rules as a "standard of behavior and behavior management techniques to create order and structure" (CDC 2016, para. 6). As stated earlier, bullies thrived in environments with a lack of structure and a lack of supervision by authority figures. Thirdly, bullying prevention programs should have included a comprehensive antibullying policy and ensured that policy is enforced and evaluated regularly (CDC, 2016 para. 7). Lastly, one of the most important best practices

is "promoting cooperation and support of staff, community leaders, lobbyists, and policy makers" (CDC, 2016, para. 7). This allowed for support and enforcement of bullying prevention programming on levels by multiple leaders in the community.

These best practices could be applied in accordance with SDT in an afterschool center setting. An elaboration of the theory will be discussed later, but for now, it could be said that SDT dealt with power and hierarchy based on social categories such as gender and age. Afterschool center staff members could apply these theories by creating a more structured environment in which they could monitor students by separating groups based on age and gender. Doing so should have decreased the occurrence of bullying based on hierarchical social categories.

Effectiveness of Antibullying Programs

Dellesaga and Adamshik (2005) stated that the most effective antibullying programs are those that utilized the peer group as a support team for victims and bullies (p. 68). Often, schools and community organizations, such as afterschool centers, had good intentions of adopting comprehensive antibullying programs, models, or curricula, but these intentions did not prevent nor discourage bullying effectively. Dellesaga and Adamshik stated that bullying programs were not effective when there was a lack of supervision and involvement from staff, parents, and students. Many times, these programs just focused on self-reporting of students about the bullying they experienced and witnessed. This approach was often limited and one dimensional (Greene, 2006). Greene claimed that infusing a human rights framework into bullying prevention efforts would combat some of the obstacles that hindered the effectiveness of bully prevention

programs. Although adopting an antibullying program is recommended throughout much of the research, there is no positive evidence that an exclusive focus on reporting, policy development, and enforcement of sanctions reduced the extent or severity of bullying in schools (Greene, 2006).

CDC Bullying Prevention Program

CDC (2016) offered a unique four-step approach to bullying prevention:

The first step was to define and then monitor the problem. The public needed to know how to identify bullying, where it existed, and who it effected. CDC accomplished this task by collecting and analyzing data vital to bullying. These data allowed decision makers to distribute resources to populations in geographic areas that needed it most.

The second step was to identify risk and protective factors, moving past the idea that bullying was a phenomenon and what the risk factors associated with bullying were. With this information, the CDC could conduct research to help answer these questions. This information would help the CDC develop or support programs that aid in reducing or eliminating some of the risk factors of bullying and victimization (CDC, 2016).

The third step was to develop and test prevention strategies using data collected in objective scientific research. With these data, the CDC developed and tested strategies to prevent bullying.

The fourth step was to assure widespread adoption of the program after analyzing the data and testing the best prevention strategies. CDC had proven results that supported the funding to communities, institutions and agencies.

LGBTQ Bullying Prevention Efforts

One reason the Jamey Rodemeyer case received so much publicity is because the young man was a fan of nationally known recording artist Lady Gaga. As a result, of Jamey Rodemeyer's death, Lady Gaga stated that she wished to meet with President Obama and discuss new legislation to counteract bullying. Lady Gaga claimed that bullying was a hate crime and "our generation has the power to end bullying" (Michaels, 2011, para. 1). Lady Gaga further stated, "bullying is a hate crime and should be considered illegal" (Michaels, 2011, para. 4). Lady Gaga's spotlight on bullying coincided with the declaration that the mother of bullycide victim, Sirdeaner Walker, made in 2009.

GLSEN

The GLSEN was a movement in place that ensured that each member of the Kindergarten to twelve grade school community was treated with respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity/expression (GLSEN, 2017, para. 1). This movement was founded in 1990, by LGBTQ teachers and has been in existence for 25 years. GLSEN (2017) had contributed to support and research of LGBTQ students in grades Kindergarten through twelve in America. In their 1999 research survey, they found that 86.2% of gay and lesbian students were harassed at school, and out of this percentage, 44.1% of these students were physically harassed (GLSEN, 2017). More alarming statistics from their National School Climate Survey gleamed that 83% of LGBTQ were verbally harassed, 24% hear homophobic remarks, and 81% of the faculty members did not step in when this bullying occurs (GLSEN, 2017).

In 2001, GLSEN partnered with MTV and promoted and sponsored a campaign that took a stand against discrimination. In 2004, GLSEN created a no-name-calling week to be implemented in Kindergarten through twelve grade schools every year on March 1-5. In 2008, GLSEN launched a highly publicized think-before-you-speak campaign. This campaign focused on messages about the negative impact of intentional or unintentional homophobic comments. Celebrities such as such as comedian and actress Wanda Sykes were one of the spokeswomen for this campaign. The tagline for this campaign was "When you say 'that's so gay,' do you realize what you say? Knock it off" (GLSEN, 2017).

New Strategies and Bullying Interventions

According to the CDC (2016), the first step for bullying prevention programs was to select and implement a research-based bullying program. The CDC recommended an intervention plan for bullies that included a behavior contract as a guideline to rehabilitate children and end their bullying behavior.

Challenges with Bullying Prevention Efforts

In 2003, many schools only encouraged and did not mandate implementation of an antibullying program because they were already on tight budgets and could not afford to enforce antibullying programs (Limber & Small, 2003, p. 450). By 2011, states, schools, and communties had experienced similar problems with implementing and enforcing antibullying prevention programming. According to CDC (201), many of the antibullying prevention programs were not funded by the state or grants and this resulted in the lack of program implementation and enforcement.

Bullying and Delinquency in Youth

Olweus coined the term *criminal bullying* in 1993. When bullying acts, as defined by Olweus (1993), occurred outside of the school setting, they were referred to as criminal bullying and involved authorities, such as the police (p. 79). Criminal bullying was associated with bullying that included the employment of criminal behaviors such as theft and damage to personal property. Olweus sought to categorize criminal bullying as a new type of bullying (p. 79). In his work, Olweus found that 60% of boys who bullied their peers during grades 6 to 9 had at least one criminal conviction by the age of 24 years (p. 80).

Olweus (1993) and Theriot et al. (2004) explored the criminal implications associated with acts of school bullying and the vulnerable population of these children who acted as bullies and engaged in aggressive bullying behavior at their schools. Some of the characteristics of school bullying were physical aggression, stealing valuables, and damage to property. Theriot et al. stated that research was still evolving that linked school bullying to later delinquency and criminal offenses (p. 77).

Kemmelmeier (2006) proposed a hierarchy-regulation argument that was demonstrated in a mock-jury study that compared individuals who had low and high social dominance orientation. Social dominance orientation was defined as an individual's orientation towards group relations. Higher levels of the orientation reflected a preference for relations that are unequal and hierarchical (Schmitt & Wirth, 2009, p. 430). The research revealed that individuals with high social dominance orientation were more favorable toward white than black offenders in terms of guilty verdicts and sentence

recommendations, whereas the opposite pattern was true for individuals with a low social dominance orientation (Kemmelmeier, 2006).

This research contributed to the literature on the criminal justice system's preference for incarceration over rehabilitation for minorities who engaged in criminal behavior. Cohen and Piquero (2009) suggested that minority youth who engaged in criminal activity were synonymous with the overtly aggressive youth that engaged in bullying behaviors during and afterschool. Cohen and Piquero found the following:

> When delinquent behavior perpetrated by minority members' matches negative stereotypes associated with that group, people easily generalized the negative appraisals of the individual perpetrator to the entire (Wilder, Simon, & Faith, 1996). Thus, social dominance orientation should not only predict harsh judgments of an ethnic minority offender, but also harsh judgments of the entire ethnic-minority group in question. (p. 419)

Cohen and Piquero suggested that when a minority youth committed a delinquent act that the negative perception by the community was not limited to the individual, but the entire ethnic group was perceived in a negative light. In addition, harsh judgments applied to the majority population of the ethnic group that engaged in delinquent and criminal behavior, and would not be limited to just the individual.

Summary

The review of literature showed that peer-to-peer bullying was a significant public health problem. Bullying occurred on school premises with elementary and high school aged children. At least 20% of children annually were physically, verbally, socially,

sexually, and/or cyber bullied in the United States. Bullying could be verbal, physical, sexual, and cyber in nature. Bullying could also be a cause of suicides and through the years' real bullyicides have been publicized, bringing more awareness to the social reality. Bullying also occurred by teachers in classrooms. A teacher bully used their power to punish, manipulate, or disparage a student beyond what would be considered a reasonable disciplinary procedure.

States had antibullying legislation in place, but that legislation did not protect children in areas outside of school premises such as afterschool centers. Research had shown that bullying continued due to many factors such as: lack of staff training, and lack of antibullying policy implementation. Although there was much research on peer-to-peer bullying prior to this research there was minimal research on peer-to-peer bullying that occurred outside of the classroom where children congregate such as afterschool centers. Examining the perspectives from afterschool staff members was one way to explore the existence of bullying. This qualitative research was designed to explore bullying at one Boys and Girls Club afterschool center to fill the gap in that research. In Chapter 3 I described the methods used to recruit the sample, collect and analyze the data, and provide justification for using a qualitative reserarch methodology.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

Peer-to-peer bullying negatively affects elementary to high school students annually. The majority of research conducted on peer-to-peer bullying has involved bullying that occurs on school grounds. There is a gap in literature with regard to peer-to-peer bullying that occurs in other areas where children congregate such as afterschool centers. The purpose of this qualitative research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. In this chapter I discuss the methodology used to measure physical, verbal, and cyberbullying that occured at the Boys and Girls Club. This research involved a qualitative design that measured the frequency and types of bullying exhibited in youth of all ages who attended the Boys and Girls Club. This qualitative design approach included one-on-one interviews with staff members over the ages of 18 about their experiences with bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. Following is the research design and rationale, role of the researcher, methodology, issues of trustworthiness, and summary.

Research Questions

The central research questions for my research are as follows:

RQ1: What are the types of bullying occurring at this Boys and Girls Club? What policies, trainings and practices are in place to minimize bullying?

RQ2: How can identified "infraction areas" be safer for participants?

Research Design and Rationale

For this research, I chose a qualitative phenomenlogical research design to investigate bullying in afterschool programs. With this research, I have added to the literature (a) information about peer-to-peer bullying in afterschool centers and (b) afterschool center staff member awareness and perceptions of bullying. Because the phenomenological approach focuses on the psychological view point of participants' interactions with events or occurences; staff member perceptions of peer-to-peer bullying were the central focus of this research.

The goal of this study was to understand and describe peer-to-peer bullying that occurred in settings outside of school. The most applicable research tradition to utilize for this research was qualitative research. Qualitative research methods are used when the reseracher wants to understand issues or situations by investigating persepctves and behavior of people in their natural settings (Kaplan & Maxwell, 2005). The qualitative approach was used with the idea that this approach would yield data that reflected the lived experiences with bullying of staff members at the Boys and Girls Club.

Another rationale for conducting qualitative research versus quantitiave research was that there was limited data in the area of bullying in afterschool programs specifically. I wanted to capture themes rather than identifying variables as to the cause, types, frequency, and infraction areas of afterschool center bullying. Previous research related to my study in that the authors had examined bullying; however, my research added depth to the topic of bullying by examining bullying in an afterschool program from a staff perspective.

For this research, I selected 11 participants from the same group (Boys and Girls Club staff members) because the literature review revealed that staff engagement and training were a major factor in decreasing peer-to-peer bullying (Greene, 2006). After much consideration, I decided that the phenomenological approach design was the appropriate strategy for this qualitative research.

Prior to deciding on the phenomenological approach, I considered and rejected several other qualitative research designs. The narrative research design was not applicable because this research was not an exploration of just one individual. Grounded theory was not chosen because this research did not aim to develop theory based on staff member perception of bullying. Ethnography was rejected because this research was not focused on a culture. Lastly, the case study approach was not used because the focus was not one case or multiple cases of bullying accounts. Also, the phenomenological approach was chosen over the case study approach because the case study calls for various data collection methods to gather information, including observation, interview, and testing, and the data collection process for this research only included semi-structured interview questions (Baker et al., 1992).

After eliminating the previous approaches, I had two more theories to narrow down, the grounded and phenomenological theories. Grounded theory and phenomenological theory are very similar, but they have some differences. These theories differ in purpose, previous knowledge, data collection, and sampling (Baker et al., 1992). Below is a review of both theories and a justification of why I used phenomenological theory in my research instead of the grounded theory approach.

Phenomenological theory was developed by Husserl and is derived from a philosophical tradition to describe psychological occurrences (Baker et al., 1992). The purpose of this theory was to examine phenomena as experienced by the participants of the inquiry (Baker et al., 1992). If my goal was to generate theory from my previous knowledge of bullying, observation, and the writings of other researchers, I would have chosen grounded theory. I examined peer-to-peer bullying at the Boys and Girls Club from a youth perspective, to gather the children lived experiences with bullying, so I utilized the phenomenological approach theory.

In phenomenological theory, the researcher's previous experience or knowledge is put to the side and suspended. This is referred to as *bracketing*, and during this step the researcher approaches the data with no preconceptions because any knowledge of the subject is taken out of the process. In terms of data collection, phenomenological theory has one main source of data, which are verbal, written, or artistic accounts from the participants being studied (Baker et al., 1992).

Both theories use nonprobability sampling, but the distinction is how the participants are selected. Phenomenological theory involves selecting participants based on purposive sampling. The sample size is deliberately small because the purpose is to examine the lived experiences of individuals (Baker et al., 1992). For this research, my sample size was small, but I selected from the population of staff members because I wanted to explore bullying from a staff member perspective. After researching the various approaches to conduct qualitative research, I decided that phenomenological theory was the best option for exploring bullying at the Boys and Girls Club.

Role of the Researcher

In the research, I was responsible and involved in every aspect of the study. I was the primary instrument for data collection, interpretation, and analysis. I was solely responsible for conducting one-on-one interviews with participants. I am a former Boys and Girls club staff member, but due to the length of time that had lapsed from my employment, I had no personal relationships with staff members or youth nor did I currently work for the Boys and Girls Club at the time of data collection.

I had bias about the research due to my former employment at a Boys and Girls Club in South Georgia. I managed biases by having a research assistant review the interview questions to ensure they were open ended and free from bias. When a researcher is the primary research instrument, they must beware of bias (Yin, 2011). From the beginning a researcher must be aware and document potential biases from personal background, motives, and anything that influences them from objectively examining the data (Yin, 2011). I also eliminated bias by ensuring the participants that their responses were confidential and participating in the research would not jeopardize their employment in any way. This statement to the participants allowed them to express themselves freely so the data yielded would be rich for this qualitative research. A statement about confidentiality in the research can be found in Appendix A.

In addition, I eliminated bias by recording participants' responses via audio recorder so that their responses were captured verbatim. I employed a research assistant during the coding and analysis process to further eliminate bias. A final way to manage bias is to be identify and analyze discrepant data. To reduce bias, a researcher must

examine supporting and discrepant data in research studies (Kaplan & Maxwell, 2005).

On March 11, 2014, the Boys and Girls Club granted me permission to conduct the

research.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

The population for this research was Boys and Girls Club staff members. The

sampling strategy for this research included a nonprobability purposive sample. With

purposive sampling, a researcher began with specific perspectives they wished to

examine and then sought out research participants who covered that range of perspectives

(Yin, 2011). In purposive sampling, the selection of participants was based on their

relevance and relation to the research questions (Yin, 2011). For this research, I wanted

to examine the types of bullying, training and policies to minimize bullying, and

infraction areas from a staff member perspective.

The participants included in this research were Boys and Girls Club staff who

volunteered to participate. Staff members at the Boys and Girls Club age 18 and up were

interviewed. The participants were asked questions related to bullying, bullying

preparedness training, reporting of bullying incidences, and other valuable information to

answer the research questions in the research. The interview questions can be found in

Appendix B.

To be eligible to participate in the research, an individual had to be an active staff

member at the Boys and Girls Club. These staff members could be full or part time and

must be 18 years of age or older. The executive director provided me with information of

the staff members' ages so that I could verify what staff members were over the age of 18.

In this research, I wanted to explore bullying at an afterschool center via staff perspectives. The sample for this research was small but provided rich data. Marshall (1996) claimed, "An appropriate sample size for a qualitative study is one that adequately answers the research question(s)" (p. 523). Marshall stated that sample sizes could be in the single digits for studies with simple research questions or very detailed studies. Furthermore, for more complex questions, a large sample with an array of sampling techniques could be used (p. 523). This research was guided by two very simple research questions, so the sample size was satisfactory. The sample for this research consisted of one group of 11 adult staff members who worked closely with youth at the Boys and Girls Club and volunteered to participate in the research. Upon Walden University, Institutional Review Board approval (Approval Number 03-13-14-0150952), I began my recruitment of the participants. I first posted flyers around the Boys and Girls Club to publicize the research to staff members and provide information of the time, date, and place of the informational meeting. This informational meeting flyer can be reviewed at Appendix A.

At this informational meeting for staff members, I provided the details of the research, handed out consent forms, and informed the potential participants of the next steps. If the staff members decided they wanted to participate, they had 3 days to contact me via phone, through e-mail, or in person. I collected the consent forms from the staff members in person or via e-mail by the fourth day. The staff members who consented to

participate in the research were chosen by criterion sampling based on the criteria that

they were a staff member of the Boys and Girls Club and over the age of 18. After I

acquired the signed permission from the staff member, the data collection began.

Per Fusch and Ness (2015), failure to reach saturation in a study can negatively

affect the quality and content validity. In a small study, data saturation will be achieved

more quickly than in a larger study. The sample size for the research was small and only

included one population. Out of the 13 staff members, 11 staff members participated in

the research. The other two staff members were under the age of 18 and not eligible to

participate. Saturation was achieved upon completion of each one-on-one participant

interview, thorough data analysis, and when no further coding was possible. At this point,

I had obtained enough information for this research to be replicated.

Instrumentation

I was the primary instrument in this qualitative research. In qualitative research,

using open- ended interviews allowed the researcher to obtain detailed and in-depth

accounts of the participants lived experiences (Kaplan & Maxwell, 2015). As a key

instrument in this research, I was responsible for collecting data on the perceptions of

staff members on bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. The purpose of an interview in a

qualitative study was to reveal the participants' meanings and interpretations about a

phenomenon (Yin, 2011). The research questions in the research aligned with the

interview questions I asked the participants, which allowed me to understand the

meanings of staff member perceptions of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. During this

process the researcher must avoid asking leading questions and the nature of the

interview can be conversational versus close ended and scripted (Yin, 2011).

To measure the frequency and type of bullying that occurred in the Boys and Girls

Club, one-on-one interviews were conducted with the staff. Staff were asked 18 questions

ranging from bullying preparedness training, the bullying that they had witnessed at the

Club, as well as other questions to get a deeper insight into the bullying that occurred

from the staff members' points of view. The questions I asked participants during the

one-on-one interviews can be found in Appendix B. Prior to the commencement of the

staff member interviews, participants provided written consent for audio recording of the

interviews and permission for me to take notes on the answers to interview questions.

After written consent was provided, staff responses were recorded via audio tape recorder

and I took detailed notes about the staff responses during the actual interviews.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The methodology flow chart that I followed consisted of four steps:

1. Invitation to participate

2. Recruited for the study via Informational meeting

3. Obtained written consent

4. Collected Data

Invitation to participate. Once I received permission from the executive director

to conduct the research I posted a flyer at the Boys and Girls club inviting staff members

to participate in the research. The flyer notified the staff members of the time, date and

location (onsite at the Boys and Girls Club) of the informational meeting. The flyer also included my phone number and e-mail address.

Recruited for the study via Informational meeting. I held the information meeting on Wednesday April 16, 2014 at the Boys and Girls Club where the research would be held. 13 staff members attended the informational meeting. During the meeting, I introduced myself and described the research. I informed staff members of the next steps which included completing the consent forms. I read the consent forms aloud to the staff members. The consent forms mentioned that their participation in the study would be confidential and that their participation had no bearing on employment at the Boys and Girls Club. I answered questions from staff about the research, told the staff members how they could reach me, and thanked them for their time.

Obtained written consent. I assumed all responsibility for collecting the consent forms from staff members. Those forms indicated that participation in the research was strictly voluntary and at any given time the participant could exit the study. The forms also indicated the one-on-one interviews would be audio recorded. I received 11 consent forms back from the staff members. The other two staff members who attended the meeting did not submit forms and verbally declined participation because they were not 18 years old.

Each returned consent form was recorded in a password-protected Excel spreadsheet. This spreadsheet was used to track what forms were received from which staff member. The spreadsheet contained the staff members' name, and Yes/no for consent/assent, and a four-character alphanumeric pseudonym. Male and female staff

were identified by a four-digit code that linked their identity. For example, for the male

staff MS01, *MS* denoted the Male staff, and *01* denoted participant 1. The corresponding

code for female staff read FS02; *FS* denoted a Female staff member, and *02* denoted

Participant 2. There were no duplications of identifiers for male and female staff

members.

After receiving the consent forms from the staff members, I sent all participants

an e-mail stating the days I would be onsite to conduct the research. In the

correspondence, I informed the staff members that the interviews would take 30 to 45

minutes. I created a schedule based on staff member availability to come onsite and

conduct one-on-one interviews. The interview schedule was April 21st to June 2, 2014

during the lunch/break times of each staff member.

Collected data. I was the sole person collecting data from Boys and Girls Club

staff members. The collection of data from one-on-one staff member interviews took

place over the course of six weeks onsite at the Boys and Girls Club. During the

interviews, I read each question aloud and ensured that each question was understood.

Interviews. Staff members were asked a total of 18 interview questions. These

interview questions can be found in Appendix B. For six weeks, I conducted one-on-one

in person interviews with Boys and Girls staff members. These interviews were

conducted during lunch breaks or scheduled breaks staff coordinated with their

supervisors. These interview questions included open-ended and closed questions, used

language familiar to staff members, were clear in intent, and free from bias. For instance,

one question asked, "Can you describe a situation where a student has come to you to

report or tell you something that has happened to them while at the club in terms of bullying?"

These interviews with staff members lasted 35 to 40 minutes each. Although some questions were close ended, staff members offered additional information in responding to the interview questions. The interview questions aligned with my research questions and their purpose was to gain the perspectives of staff members of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club.

Audio recordings. I audio recorded the interviews for accuracy with prior consent from the participants. If a participant decided they no longer wanted to participate in the research, he or she could stop and be removed from the research. In addition, if a participant opted out of being audio recorded they could notify me and I would stop the recording. This did not occur during my data collection. Prior to transcribing the interview recordings, I ensured participant anonymity. I hired a research assistant/transcriber to transcribe the audio tapes and signed a confidentiality agreement. The transcriber did not reside in the region where the Boys and Girls Club was located or the vicinity of participants. I utilized the transcriptions and memos collected during the interviews to compile the data. This is further described in the "Data Collection and Analysis" section.

Before I started the interview, I built rapport and trust with the Boys and Girls Club staff. I wanted the staff members to know that I was not an outsider and was once employed by the Boys and Girls Club. This allowed me to nurture trust and comfort between the staff member and myself. After the interview was completed I debriefed the

participant, explaining the purpose of the research and how the information collected in

the interviews was vital to the overall success of my research.

The exit strategy for the participant interviews included me asking the participants

if they had any questions and reiterating that they could contact me with questions at any

time if they couldn't think of any at the moment. I also expressed my gratitude for the

subject's participation.

The follow-up procedure and member checking after each interview allowed me

to listen to the audio recordings and write down a summary of each interview. I read each

summary aloud paragraph by paragraph so the participant would have the opportunity to

clarify, elaborate, or make corrections to the information as needed. Lastly, a paid

research assistant/transcriber transcribed the audio recordings within 3 weeks of the

participant interviews and saved this information in a password-protected file. I imported

the audio recordings into a password protected media file to protect the sensitive material

collected from participants.

Data Analysis Plan

This qualitative research involved examining staff member perception of peer-to-

peer bullying at one Boys and Girls Club. The research provided for the collection of data

to address staff perceptions through one-on-one interviews. I analyzed the data collected

from this research via coding, audio recordings, and interview transcripts.

Analysis of data through the development of themes guided the research. I coded

and analyzed data using first, second, and level coding for qualitative research. These

coding methods were applicable to research that used interview questions as the primary

method of data collection. Interview questions were aligned with the two research questions for this research. Each interview question allowed the staff member to share their perception of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. The research explored peer-to-peer bullying at one afterschool center with a focus on the types of bullying, policies and training used to minimize bullying, and identifying infraction areas where bullying occurred.

Once the interviews were completed, I allowed each participant to review their audio-recorded interview responses and handwritten notes I took during the interview. This form of member checking ensured that I recorded their responses accurately and free from bias. If I recorded something incorrectly, I gave the participant an opportunity to clarify. Next I employed a research assistant to aid in transcribing the interview responses. Once the transcription was complete for each participant I allowed each participant to review their individual transcript to control for my own bias. For the coding process, I arranged all responses by question and then categorized these responses to initial themes. Lastly, I started the analysis of specific themes and subthemes and recorded these themes on an excel spreadsheet keeping track of how many responses I gathered for each theme.

Issues of Trustworthiness

I addressed the way in which validity, reliability, and objectivity took place in the research. Qualitative researchers measure the credibility of their work via transparency, consistency-coherence, and communicability. Below I describe how I addressed issues of trustworthiness in this qualitative research.

Credibility (Internal Validity)

I achieved internal validity through triangulation, and member checking. I accomplished triangulation by matching the participants' audio recorded interview responses with the handwritten interview notes I took during the one-on-one interviews. I took this step to ensure I accurately captured the participants' responses free from subjectivity and bias. The next step to accomplishing internal validity was through member checking. Member checking took place during the one-on-one interview process and after I transcribed the interview responses with the help of an employed research assistant. During member checking participants had the opportunity to review my handwritten interview notes and tentative interpretations after the interview to see if I recorded their responses accurately. Member checking took place again after I transcribed the data and the participants had an opportunity to review and verify the transcriptions.

Transferability (External Validity)

Yin (2011) stated that external validity can be achieved if the findings of one study can be applied and generalized to another study. Yin shared best practices in qualitative research in that research should be conducted as if someone was monitoring every process. With respect to best practices, I provided rich, specific descriptions to explain the findings of the research. By using rich, in-depth descriptions from participants' responses, I could convey their lived experiences and perceptions of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. I established transferability by creating a clear protocol that listed the steps to conduct the research so that another researcher could duplicate it. Yin suggested researchers develop a formal database so that another

researcher could review findings. I established this database for future researchers wanting to replicate the research so they would not have to solely rely on a written report. The reader or this research or a future researcher should be able to trace the findings in either direction from the initial research questions, to the conclusion and back (Yin, 2011).

Dependability (The Qualitative Counterpart to Reliability)

Dependability was achieved by establishing an audit trail that consisted of maintaining, preserving and securing data. All transcripts, notes, and audio tapes associated with this research were kept secure under password protection and I am the only person with access to that data. Throughout the process I created audit trails by recording field notes and other documentation during the one on one interviews with Boys and Girls Club staff members.

Confirmability (The Qualitative Counterpart to Objectivity).

Yin (2011) stated that confirmability is established when a researcher links the data to related sources. I established confirmability by reporting each participants' response objectively. I attempted to report each participants' experience free from bias, or self-interest. Furthermore, participants had the opportunity to review their responses after the interview and after I transcribed (with the help of a research assistant) the transcribed notes. This form of member checking allowed participants to verify their wording to ensure accuracy and decrease subjectivity.

Ethical Procedures

To ensure the ethical rights of the participants were considered and protected this research was approved by the Walden University Institutional Review Board prior to any invitation to participate. On March 11, 2014, the executive director of the Boys and Girls Club granted me permission to conduct this research with Boys and Girls Club staff members. Creswell (2014) stated that research that involved human subjects or data collected from human subjects raised ethical and policy concerns that need to be considered. The information from this research could potentially expose the Boys and Girls Club in a negative light so anonymity and confidentiality were established. The name of each participant was kept confidential and coded by pseudonym on all documents.

The participants had the right to decide not to participate at any time for any reason. Another major ethical consideration was keeping the responses from the staff members confidential. Staff members were informed that any response they provided would remain confidential and no personal information would be shared with other staff members or parents. Staff members were also informed that participating in the research would not jeopardize their employment at the Boys and Girls Club.

Research data will be kept secure in a locked, fire proof safe in my home for seven years, or five years' post publication, whichever time frame comes first. I am the only person with access to this safe. The data will be destroyed after the set time frame. Data removal from this secure location only occurred during data entry and was returned to the secure safe after data entry was completed.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. Chapter 3 involved examining methodologies used to explore bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. In this chapter I discussed how I recruited participants for the research, the research design and approach chosen, and the processes for data analysis and verification. A phenomenological theory approach was chosen because my goal was to explore bullying at an afterschool center from a staff perspective. The methods used to collect data for this research were one-on-one face-to-face interviews with 11 adult staff members and audio recordings, which were transcribed manually. In Chapter 4, results yielded from this research on bullying at the Boys and Girls Club will be discussed.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. In Chapter 4, I have summarized the results of research aimed at exploring bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. The themes that emerged from the research were framed by the research questions and described in this chapter. The results of this research included information that will allow Boys and Girls Club staff members to develop an effective antibullying program and antibullying staff training to reduce bullying. These findings are also of use for state legislators who could use results from this research to support antibullying legislation expansion to cover afterschool programs. This chapter was organized into seven sections: (a) setting, (b) demographics, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, (e) evidence of trustworthiness, (f) results, and (g) summary.

The central research questions for my research are as follows:

RQ1: What are the types of bullying occurring at this Boys and Girls Club? What policies, trainings and practices are in place to minimize bullying?

RQ2: How can identified "infraction areas" be safer for participants?

Setting

The research site used for this research was a Boys and Girls Club. Five schools in the county school system had children who made up the membership of this Boys and Girls Club. Approximately 210 children attended the club daily for the afterschool program, and the summer program increased to about 320 members. The hours of operation for the afterschool program were 2 p.m. to 8 p.m., Monday through Friday. The

hours of operation for the summer program were 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday. There were about 11 to 13 staff members who worked at this Boys and Girls Club over the age of 18. This club also included some junior staff under the age of 18 and several volunteers.

Demographics

This research involved examining bullying at one Boys and Girls Club from the perspective of staff members ages 18 and over. All participants in the research were African American. Four men and seven women participated in the research. Other demographics included years of employment at the Boys and Girls Club, age range of staff members, and age group the staff member worked with. The breakdown of the participants and their code identifiers appear in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Profile

Participant	Gender	Code Identifier	Race	Years of Employment at the Boys & Girls Club	Participant Age Range	Age Group worked with
Staff Member A	Male	MS01	African American	3 years	27-35	6-12th grade
Staff Member B	Male	MS02	African American	7 months	27-35	Teens 13-18 years
Staff Member C	Male	MS03	African American	2 years	18-26	All age groups
Staff Member D	Female	FS01	African American	7 years	36-45	Teens
Staff Member E	Female	FS02	African American	10 years	36-45	All age groups
Staff Member F	Female	FS03	African American	6 months	36-45	Teens
Staff Member G	Male	MS04	African American	5 years	36-45	All age groups
Staff Member H	Female	FS04	African American	4 months	18-26	K-5
Staff Member I	Female	FS05	African American	4 months	27-35	K-5
Staff Member J	Female	FS06	African American	1 year	18-26	6-12th grade
Staff Member K	Female	FS07	African American	8 months	27-35	All age groups

Data Collection

Data were collected via in-person one-on-one interviews with 11 staff members at the Boys and Girls Club. The interviews were scheduled based on availability the staff shared when they turned in their consent forms. Participants submitted the consent forms to me in person prior to the one-on-one interview. The in-person interviews were scheduled over the course of 2 days for 30 to 45 minutes during the participants' lunch

hours. These interviews were audio recorded by a digital audio recorder, and the names of participants were kept confidential. Data collection lasted 6 weeks from April 21, 2014 to June 2, 2014 during the lunch/break times of each staff member. Data from the interviews were housed in a locked safe in my home office that only I have access to during the research and post research. These data will remain secure for 5 years.

The one-on-one interviews with staff members focused on the research questions. The content of the questions included demographics, length of employment at the Boys and Girls Club, age group the employee served, types and frequency of bullying, location where bullying occurred, age groups and genders with the most conflict, bullying training at the Boys and Girls Club, bullying policies at the Boys and Girls Club, disciplinary steps taken regarding bullying at the Boys and Girls Club, support for the bully and victim, and employees' opinions regarding training, bullying policies, and discipline.

For the first three interview questions, I focused on the profile of the staff member. The questions concerned the ages of the staff members, their length of employment at that Boys and Girls Club, and which age group they primarily served. Interview Questions 4 through 9 and 11 through 18 were developed to address the first research question: What types of bullying occur at this Boys and Girls Club, and what policies, trainings and practices are in place to minimize bullying? These questions can be found in Appendix B. Interview Question 10 was developed to address the second research question: How can identified "infraction areas" be safer for participants? This question can be found in Appendix B as well.

Data Analysis from Interviews

The data analysis process consisted of transcribing, data reduction via coding, and interpreting the data.

Transcribing

After collecting data, I employed a research assistant to aid me with transcribing and coding the data. The research assistant and I reviewed handwritten notes I took during data collection simultaneously to decrease misinterpretation and subjectivity. Next, I typed up handwritten transcribed notes from the one-on-one interviews and saved this document in a password-protected file. Typing up the notes made it easier to begin the next step of data analysis, which was the coding process.

Coding

For this research, I decided to manually code the data instead of using qualitative software to code the data. I chose to manually code the data because my sample size was so small (Saldana, 2009). No names were used in this research, and all names were coded to protect confidentiality and privacy. Prior to the research commencing, each participant was required to complete a staff member consent form. The staff member consent form contained information about the details of the research and emphasized that the participants' identity would remain confidential. First, I did descriptive coding about the demographics of each participant. Descriptive coding is a first cycle coding method used in qualitative research. In descriptive coding, data are assigned basic labels to provide an inventory of their topics (Saldana, 2009). This level of coding consisted of basic

categories such as male/female, age range, and years or employment. I coded this data on an Excel spreadsheet and presented that information in Table 1.

The second level of coding was topic or open coding. Topic coding, also called open coding, is the level of coding in which categories are initially identified during qualitative data analysis (Yin, 2011). With this level of coding, I derived my themes from participant responses and commonalities (Saldana, 2009). Each theme was organized based on similar topics. For example, a few participants stated that expulsion was not an effective means of rectifying bullying behavior. From that topic, the theme of support for the bully was identified. In addition, this level of coding included subcategories. Every time a participant mentioned training, that would become a concept or theme, and frequency and type became subcategories. I added this level of coding to the same spreadsheet as the first level of coding.

The next level of coding was axial coding. Axial coding is the separation of core themes during qualitative analysis (Yin, 2011). During this level of coding, categories are developed and linked with subcategories (Yin, 2011). During this level, I focused on similar themes, variables, and contrast in the data (Saldana, 2009). For example, one participant said that the Boys and Girls Club had antibullying training every year, whereas another participant said that the Boys and Girls Club did not have any antibullying training in place. Saldana (2009) stated that one of the goals of axial coding is saturation. Saturation occurs when no new information emerged during coding and after thorough analysis (Saldana, 2009). With the help of a research assistant, I transcribed the audio recordings from participant interviews with staff members. While

developing themes on the second level of coding, I received input from my research

assistant who helped me to narrow down themes without repetition and to ensure

saturation was reached. This level of coding was also recorded on the same spreadsheet

as the coding levels prior. Each code had its own category to prepare for the next steps of

interpreting and interconnecting the data (Saldana, 2009).

Common themes were identified from the participants despite their differing years

and months of employment, their genders, and their age groups. Table 2 contains the

various themes that emerged from the data, including a description of those themes.

Table 2

Themes and Descriptions

Themes	Descriptions
Bullying Basics	Bullying definition, staff understanding, alternative methods, removing youth from environment
Age groups with most conflict	Main reasons for peer-to-peer conflict, gender with the most conflict
Types of bullying	Physical, Verbal, Cyber, bullying at school (carryover to Boys and Girls Club), bully victims, snitching/bystanders, witnesses
Characteristics	Bullies, victims
Location of bullying	Outside, gym, game room, computer lab
Reporting	Youth report to staff member bullying they have witnessed, staff overhear conversations, actual victims report bullying they have experienced
Disciplinary methods	Speak to youth, write up, contact parent, suspension from Boys and Girls Club or program area, expulsion
Support	Bullies and victims

(table continues)

Themes	Descriptions
Staff member insight on how the youth perceive bullying	Age group, understanding of bullying, labeling bad children as bullies because of their bad behaviors
Policy	Sufficient information for staff, parents, and children
Training	Frequency, content, type, attendees, ideal
Bullying aftermath	Does the bullying stop, number of children that leave the Boys and Girls Club

Bullying Basics

How staff members perceived bullying heavily influenced how they defined bullying. Some staff members had attended training and felt that they had a solid idea of what bullying looked like and how to deal with it. FS01 said, "I remember attending an antibullying training, I believe the name of the training was the Olweus antibullying training." Olweus was a pioneer in bullying research, and his work is regarded as the standard of knowledge in bullying (High, 2007). FS05 stated, "For some reason students are comfortable talking to me about bullying, but sometimes it is hard to determine if they are tattle-tailing on one another or really reporting a bullying event." FS05 continued, "I do not care for tattle-tailing. I separate that from and do not count that as bullying."

MS02 believed that most of the activity between the children was horseplay and not bullying. In addition, he stated that sometimes a child reported minor incidents, such

as pushing and hit and runs. The Boys and Girls Club does not allow fighting, so that may be the reason MS02 had not witnessed a lot of physical fights, but he did witness a lot of horseplay. If the staff member did take the allegations of bullying seriously in these situations, oftentimes it was discovered that on that day, one child was just not in the mood to play and claimed that it was bullying. FS03 also commented on the behavior being viewed as horseplay instead of bullying: "Physical fights are horseplay and not actual fighting. Horeseplaying ain't serious, but could be an issue if the playing escalates and the staff member was not around to stop it." MS04 agreed that children engaged in horseplay and that this behavior was not viewed as bullying. MS04 said,

Children would mention bullying sometimes during horseplay, but I am not sure if they know what it [bullying] means for real. Most times kids are friends, but that day one wants to play and another does not. Then the child that was not in the mood for playing would say they were being bullied.

These instances are hard to decipher because, as MS04 stated, "I am not on the program floor much to witness folks bullying other folks." FS05 stated, "I do not necessarily believe that children picking on each other is a form of bullying." FS05 continued, "Children get talked about and pushed and shoved every day, but I have never seen a situation where a child was being bullied so badly that they moped around like the world was against them."

Some staff members shared information pertaining to how they believed that the youth defined bullying. Most staff members responded that youth did not understand the definition of bullying or what actions or behaviors constituted bullying. MS01stated,

"Many children claimed that they were being bullied when they had disagreements with their peers, but I am not sure that they really understand what bullying is." MS01 continued, "I notice kids would say that they were bullied because someone would not leave them alone, and the kid might not realize that they could have triggered that behavior and were actually doing the same thing as the 'bully."

This behavior happened many times at the Boys and Girls Club, and MS01said, "I often have to sit down and explain what bullying was to the children." MS01 stated, "I told the children that if they bothered one member and the member gets upset and argued or hit them, that then they would both be in trouble". Normally after the children had disagreements and reported to staff that they experienced bullying; they were friends shortly after. Lastly, MS01 shared, "Girls in sixth through twelve grade were the main ones to argue about something, get parents involved, and then be friends the next day."

MS02 shared his perspective of peer-to-peer bullying and the perception that youth had about their peers. MS02 shared that sometimes when children reported bullying and the staff member investigated, the staff member would discover that bullying had not occurred; youth interacted with each other in different ways, and the students who reported bullying might have done so because they were not used to that type of interaction. MS02 stated, "Basically, one child might interpret a slap on the back as bullying but that could be the way the kids say hello or greeted another person." MS02 continued, "I have observed that kids greet their friends in certain ways based on the environment and the relationship with that person or group."

FS02 shared, "Some children do not know what bullying is and that it means picking on someone else. I am surprised that when I speak to them about their bullying behaviors, they do not consider teasing another student bullying." Responses of staff members and youth perceptions of bullying varied about how the staff members defined the type of bullying they witnessed or bullying that youth reported.

Age Groups with the Most Conflict

Each staff member was asked which age range out of the age groups they worked with had the most conflict and what those issues were. MS01 shared, "I worked with children in grades 6 to 12, and the bulk of the conflicts included *he said, she said* issues." MS02 worked with teens, ages 13 to 18, and stated, "This age group mainly has difficulty with maturity levels and personality conflicts." MS03 worked with all age groups and stated "The age group with the most conflict is fourth grade all day. They argue and talk about each other all the time." FS01 had experience with various age groups including teens and grades 6 to 12. In contrast to MS03, FS01 stated "The group with the most conflict was middle school. Their issues are gossip, feeling like they don't fit in anywhere, and taking their frustrations out on other kids." FS01 continued, "The kids are in an awkward position at this age; every decision is not made for them, but they are not yet in high school where their decisions were trusted." FS02 worked with all age groups, including teens, and shared, "The group with the most conflict are the younger children in elementary school. Their main issues were that they got into cliques and start doing the *he said, she said stuff*." FS03 worked with all age groups and shared that elementary and middle school students were the age groups with the most conflict. The main issue with

this group of kids was that they often cracked jokes on each other and someone ended up "getting their feelings hurt."

MS04 worked with all age groups but shared that the age group with the most conflict were middle school students. MS04 had the same experience as FS02 and said, "The issue this age group faced was *he said, she said* conflict." FS04 worked with kindergarten through fifth grade boys and girls and stated, "The group with the most conflict is the fifth-grade girls because they fuss all the time and say they do not like some girls because they are *lame*, *corny*, *weird*, or not *cute*." FS05 rotated from working with kindergarten through fifth grade to working with all ages, and she saw a different age group every day. FS05 shared that the group with the most conflict was the fifth-grade girls. Their main issues were gossip and dating. Their conflict stemmed from dating issues, jealousy, and talking about each other. FS06 worked with young girls 6 to 12 years old and supported that fifth-grade girls were the group with the most conflict. FS06 supervised the fifth-grade girls and said their issues ranged from bullying, to boyfriend and girlfriend rumors, to general "drama." FS07 worked with third graders and noticed that the bulk of the conflict came from the third and fifth graders. FS07 stated, "The fifth graders have conflict centered on gossip and calling each other names like *ugly* and *fat*."

Each staff member shared information about the different groups they worked with and how each of these groups dealt with conflict and issues specific to their age range and maturity. Although staff seemed to work with different age groups, the group that seemed to have the most conflict was middle school, and more specifically, the fifth-

grade girls. The middle school girls exhibited many bullying characteristics and were the source of most of the conflict in the education classes at the Boys and Girls Club.

Types of Bullying

The next theme I discovered were the types of bullying that occurred at the Boys and Girls Club. I asked the staff members if they had witnessed various types of bullying such as physical, cyber, verbal (teasing and taunting), bullying that occurred at school and carried over to the Boys and Girls Club, snitching (bystanders and witnesses) and bully victims. The first form of bullying I explored was physical bullying.

Physical bullying. MS01 indicated that, "In the past month I have seen one physical fight among the students. Children fight over petty stuff and then start to push each other which may start a fight." MS02 shared his experience with physical bullying, "Every once in a while, I notice physical bullying, normally kids would push or kick each other." MS03 witnessed more physical fights than MS02. MS03 shared, "I saw at least three physical fights within the last month but the thing I see daily are arguing amongst the kids." FS01's account of the physical fights was similar to MS03's. FS01 explained, "There are probably not a lot of fights at the Boys and Girls Club because they [children] know that they will get suspended if they fight." FS02 witnessed less physical fights than MS03, but shared the same sentiments about children arguing daily. FS02 shared, "In the last month I have not seen one physical fight, but the real, true conflict are the arguments kids have." FS03 shared that the physical fights were more like child's play, "These fights are not serious but could turn serious if the kids go too far." FS03 continued,

"These incidents do not escalate because staff stop them in their tracks, we have to nip problems in the bud."

MS04 and FS02 had not witnessed any physical fights within the past month. FS04 witnessed one physical fight, "There is only one fight I can think of in the past month and it involved a girl and a boy in the fourth grade." FS05 stated, in 4 months of employment at the Boys and Girls Club there had not been many physical fights, but there were arguments, and she usually tried to stop them before they got to the point of a physical altercation. FS06 stated, "There has been two physical fights in the last month. One involved a child in Kindergarten and the other a child in the fifth grade." Lastly, FS07 shared, there had not been any physical fights in the last month, but there were two in the last eight months.

Most of the staff responses in this theme stated that there were 0 to 2 physical fights in the previous month. Two staff members stated they witnessed three to four physical fights within the last month. I inquired about physical fights the staff members witnessed in the past month, but some staff shared that during their employment they had either witnessed a physical altercation or they had not. One of the main themes in speaking with the staff was that the threat of suspension from the Boys and Girls Club deterred most of the children from fighting.

Cyberbullying. The next sub-theme was the existence of cyberbullying. When MS01was asked about cyberbullying at the Boys and Girls Club, he had not witnessed or been informed of teasing or bullying over the Internet. When asked about Boys and Girls Club policy he said, "there is a "no social networks" policy at the Boys and Girls Club. A

lot of children have phones but staff members tell them to put them in a bag or pocket." MS02 had the same experience and stated that he had never witnessed or had a child report cyberbullying to him. MS03 noted, "I have witnessed cyberbullying, and even though being on social media is not allowed at the Boys and Girls Club, a lot of the conflict amongst the children comes from stuff on social media." FS01 shared that some children mention things that are on Facebook and Instagram. Staff members try to speak to the children about being careful about what they put on the Internet, but the students say "they have free speech and can say what they want." FS01 gave the children examples to help illustrate the point. She continued, "people post comments on Facebook and get fired or in trouble. Social media took away the face-to-face confrontation (good and bad) that kids used to have. Some children post subliminal stuff and then have issues because of it." According to FS01, children were more aggressive on social media and used that as a platform to be confident and bold when in conflict with someone. She continued, "I notice that children feel that they are invisible when they were on social media as opposed to face-to-face confrontations." In contrast to the experience of FS01, FS02 and FS03 had never had bullying brought to their attention.

FS03 had not physically witnessed cyberbullying among the students but said that once a kid in elementary school informed him of being bullied in school. MS04 had the same experience and had also not been informed of any cyberbullying. FS04 had not witnessed cyberbullying but was informed about an incident that started at school and ended at the Boys and Girls Club. FS05 and FS06 had no reports of bullying since their employment. FS07 shared the responses of other participants, "I have not witnessed any

cyberbullying at the Boys and Girls Club but social media is not allowed at the Club, so my age group cannot get on their phones to visit social media sites anyway."

Most the staff members responded that they had not witnessed cyberbullying, nor had a student reached out to them to report it. One staff member said that a student was discussing a cyberbullying event that had happened at school, but not an incident specifically dealing with cyberbullying at the Boys and Girls Club. One of the main reasons there was little to no cyberbullying at the Boys and Girls Club may be because the Boys and Girls Club did not allow the students to have their cell phones with them, nor do they allow the students to use social media on the computer or on their phone while at the Boys and Girls Club.

Verbal bullying. The next type of bullying discussed was the existence of verbal bullying. Staff members shared that most students got in verbal altercations versus physical altercations. MS03 shared, "One student in my class is picked on often because of his last name. Every time I hear the other students laughing and teasing him I tell them to knock it off before they get written up." Specifically, FS01 shared her experience, "Students tease and taunt about something they heard or saw on Facebook." Once a student cursed on the bus, and the root of the incident was other students teasing him and he could not take any more."

FS03 shared that the students she worked with teased and cracked a lot of jokes. FS04 shared that once a student reported that an older boy was constantly teasing and taunting a smaller, younger girl. The other students claimed that the smaller female student was not getting bullied but was rather lying about other students to get attention.

FS04 said, "When I got wind of this I told the student to let the kid being bullied know that it was not nice to tell lies about other students as doing so could get the other students in trouble."

FS05 shared that a new fifth grade girl came to her class for Spring Break and some of the girls verbally bullied her. "I remember the new girl in art class and the other girls laughing and joking about her and singling her out." FS05 I addressed the bullying and scolded the girls. She scolded saying that if the girl was new and only with the Boys and Girls Club a short while then the girls should stop bullying and do a better job of embracing her. She also warned they could get written up if the behavior continued.

FS06 experienced a situation concerning two girls who used to be friends. She said that one girl picked on the other because she did not like the fact that her former friend dated a boy at the Boys and Girls Club. FS06 said "The girl doing the bullying would say sly remarks to the other girl in front of the other students." Lastly, FS07 shared that one boy got verbally picked on often because of the size of his head. FS07 said when she heard kids bullying she would threaten them with suspension.

Not all staff members directly experienced their student groups taunting and teasing. The staff members who shared their experiences all took the step of stopping the bullying as soon as it was reported or as soon as they witnessed it. In addition, the staff members let the children know that the Boys and Girls Club did not tolerate bullying and that if they did not want to get written up, they should stop.

Characteristics of Bullies and Victims

Bullies. In speaking with some of the staff, another theme emerged: the characteristics staff members designated as relating to bullies and victims. MS02 shared, "One thing I see about bullies is that despite the consequences of discipline, the bullying does not stop." MS02 continued, "when bullies return from punishment, they go back to bullying other children." FS04 shared some characteristics, "Many fifth-grade girls get picked on because the other girls feel like they are lame, corny, weird, or not cute enough." If a girl was a new student, she got picked on by a clique of fifth grade girls. FS05 shared, "one girl shared that on one of her first days at the Boys and Girls Club, one of the other fifth grade girls called her fat, ugly, and heavy."

Bully victims. Bully victims are students who have experienced peer-to-peer bullying but who have also at some point engaged in bullying others. Only a couple of staff members had experience with bully victims. FS05 shared that after a bullying incident the girl who reported the bullying was in trouble for bullying another child and hanging out with other girls who bully. The staff member spoke to the girls about being mean and said that it was confusing because the girl who reported the bullying was not hanging out with the same girls that were talking about her.

Bystanders/witnesses. MS02 stated, "Children felt comfortable telling me about bullying they see; the children especially felt comfortable when they had witnessed the whole thing. They feel really comfortable then." FS01 attended a training based on the theories of Olweus. This training included an exercise that helped staff members identify bullies, victims, and bystanders. FS01 used this exercise on the children at the Boys and

Girls Club, and her findings became beneficial when dealing with bullying incidences. FS01 stated, "Most often other students who were bystanders reported the bullying they had witnessed to me; but the victim of bullying rarely ever came to report the bullying themselves." The literature on bullying shed light on the fact that some legislatures, school officials, and individuals who work with youth did not take peer-to-peer bullying seriously (Dorning, 2009; AP, 2012).

Location of Bullying

The staff members had different accounts of where the bullying occurred at the Boys and Girls Club. MS02 witnessed bullying in the game room and gym. MS03 witnessed bullying in the gym, bathrooms, and game room. FS01 agreed and said that bullying mainly occurred in the bathrooms, gym, game room, and outside in big open areas. FS01 said, "This may be because there is more opportunity for free play. The other staff may think that the children are just sitting in a group when there is actually a bullying situation." FS02 said, "The location of bullying depends on the location of the children at the time. I have witnessed bullying in the learning center, computer lab, and gym." FS03 had observed bullying during outside activities. FS03 shared, "Outside, staff tend to get lax on supervision." FS03 had not witnessed bullying at the gym but said, "On the bus the children are rambunctious because they just got out of school. There is a higher chance of bullying at this time."

MS04 witnessed bullying occurring during transition in the hallways between program areas. FS04 said that the bullying transpired in the classroom. In contrast, FS05 experienced student bullying in program areas and the gym. FS05 added, "Children can

hang out with their friends, form cliques, and talk about the other children with little

supervision in the gym." FS06 agreed that bullying mainly occurred in the gym, hallway

and game room. Finally, FS07 shared, "Bullying happens everywhere at the Boys and

Girls Club, but I try to keep it out of my room. I do this by separating the groups that

gossip." However, even though FS07 said that bullying occurred everywhere, she

noticed, "bullying happens in the bathroom because there are no staff members to

supervise the area and smaller children could possibly get bullied by the girls that gang

up on them in the bathroom."

Reporting

Each staff member had different perception of students' reporting behaviors.

MS01 shared that once a student reported a bullying incident that involved an older boy

and a second-grade girl. Many students had reported this same incident, and they said that

the older boy was always messing with a smaller girl in second grade. MS01 said, "I

think she got bullied because she looked smaller than a second grader." Students reported

that the older boy was messing with the little girl and chasing her. MS01 spoke to the

bully but, "but he did not understand that this was bullying." MS01 had a conversation

with the bully to explain bullying and that behavior was not acceptable at the Boys and

Girls Club. "I even suggested that if the male student had an issue with the second-grade

girl, then maybe he should move away from her."

MS02 stated, "Students report bullying to me, but the reports are not anything

serious; they were simple issues like "he took my book bag, drink, soda, and food."

MS02 shared that students do report bullying, but they are bullying incidents that

occurred while the students were at school and not at the Boys and Girls Club. MS03 shared, "I mostly overhear conversations that students have about bullying, or the students come to me and report bullying that they see". FS01 had the same experience with reporting as MS03. FS01 heard conversations about students being bullied, and based on those conversations would speak with the parties mentioned about the incident. FS01 said, "Other times, students come to me and report bullying they have seen; however, the bullies never come to report bullying behaviors." FS02 stated that a couple of students would report bullying they were aware of. FS02 shared, "Usually the children are reporting verbal bullying. Sometimes I approach the children and ask them follow up questions, and then I bring it to the program director's attention."

FS03 shared that she would sometimes hear conversations about bullying but that mainly the children did more joking around. FS03 stated, "Joking can be a form of bullying, and I witnessed children cracking jokes with one another." FS03 shared one time that stuck out in her mind, "One time the children were talking about another child and would not stop. I saw that for myself so now one had to tell me what happened." MS04 said that a lot of times the children came to him to report bullying, especially about horseplay. "With horse playing, I get to the bottom of the situation. I usually find it wasn't bullying. The kid who said he was being bullied wasn't in the mood for playing and screamed bullying." Lastly, MS04 spoke about not taking power away from other staff members. "One time a student kept getting bullied, I asked if they told the staff member in their area. The child said no." MS04 shared the child should speak to the staff

in that area because if they handled the situation they would be taking power away from that staff member.

FS04 could not recall a specific situation when a child reported a bullying incident to her but stated, "I feel confident that the children feel comfortable telling me if anything like bullying was going on." FS05 shared, "Most of the time I hear or see the bullying that goes on, but other times the children tell me what happened." FS06 also shared "Students feel comfortable with me and tell me about bullying they witness or experience. FS07 shared students felt free to report bullying incidents. One boy who was in her class was always getting picked on because of the size of his head. FS07 dealt with this situation and said, "I pulled the kids to the side to ask and see what was going on. If I found bullying, I referred them to the program director for suspension if the situation is really bad." FS07 continued, "When it comes to bullying, I am always dealing with the same group of third grade girls with one ring-leader who gossips and creates drama."

Disciplinary Methods

The interviewees gave responses about how the Boys and Girls Club disciplined students who were found guilty of bullying their peers. MS01stated, "We have a zero-tolerance policy for bullying, but the policies at different Boys and Girls Clubs in the state are inconsistent." MS01 did not support policies that expelled bullies. "This does not solve the problem. There are other ways that staff members could handle bullies because most of the time the bullies just want to be active. Staff is responsible for creating structured and engaging activities."

MS01shared more, "The biggest issue with afterschool programming and bullying is that sometimes the person who is considered a bully needs to be in a different type of role such as leader. These roles help children with their socialization issues." MS01also shared his disciplinary methods. "I discipline the children by coaching and mentoring them to make them see different options for resolving issues. If that strategy does not work, then I resort to a parent meeting to reach a resolution."

MS02 had a similar strategy when it came to discipline with bullying situations. MS02 conducted a counseling session with children to redirect their negative behavior. If that does not work MS02 writes them up or suspends them. MS02 said, "The first couple of times I try to talk and work with the children, but if they exhibit continuous negative bullying behavior, expulsion might be an inevitable next step."

MS03 disciplined bullies much like MS01 and MS02. MS03 stated, "First I talk to the kids and then the parents to make sure they know what is going on." FS01's methods are more structured and she followed the Boys and Girls Club's specific five step disciplinary protocol for bullying or any other behaviors: Step 1) Individual guidance: the staff member speaks to the child to see what is going on. There could be something going on at home. Step 2) Time out: the student is taken away from activity. Step 3) Suspension: the child is not allowed to participate in the Boys and Girls Club programs (i.e. the gym or the trips) for a designated period. Step 4) Parent meeting, and Step 5) Expulsion. FS02 stated, "Nine out of ten times, depending on which staff member was involved, we pull children in the office and speak to them about what happened." FS03 dealt with disciplinary matters much like FS02. FS03's method of discipline included a

verbal warning and then a write up is issued. If further disciplinary action is required, then FS03 would call the parents and suspend the child. MS04 dealt with bullies and discipline in a similar fashion as the other staff members. MS04 held a sit down and had a discussion with all parties and make parents aware that the bullying was brought to staff's attention. MS04 continued, "I try to document the incident and send the information to headquarters downtown just in case any problems surface."

FS04 did not use the mediation approach like other staff members. Instead, FS04 wrote the student up for inappropriate behavior and then called the parent. If that did not work, then FS04 suspended the student. FS05's discipline differed and first gave a verbal warning, then a write up. "If those two steps do not work or the incident is too severe, then I take the child to the main office where they discuss suspension or possible expulsion." FS06 shared that the Boys and Girls Club had zero tolerance for bullying and bad behavior from students, and if students misbehaved FS06 would speak with them and/or write them up. "I want to understand both sides of the situation to see if someone is lying. From there I send the member to the Director, and he decides if they are suspended from the Boys and Girls Club."

FS07 shared her steps. Step 1) a write up, Step 2) suspension, and Step 3) possible expulsion. Most write ups were not for bullying, but for misbehaving and not following the rules. If bullying was found, the child got written up and then parents called. Three write ups equaled a suspension, "but we [staff members] tried to exercise positive punishment initially because we do not want to punish children." FS07 shared, "I think the person here who deals with discipline the best and has the best influence on the kids

is the program director." FS07 continued, "I notice that children go to the program director to resolve issues, and if she tells them not to do something, they do not do it, and this eliminates a lot of the disciplinary issues at our Club."

Each staff member had a different approach to discipline, there was not one universal way to handle a bullying situation. Some staff believed that the discipline warranted a conversation and possible medication, while others believed that bullying behavior warranted a write up only. Collectively, the staff members administered discipline on a case by case basis; no one staff member disciplined students the same way for the same incident. This lack of standardized punishment made it easier for the children to manipulate the situation based on their relationship with staff. Also, if a staff member gave one child a harsher punishment than another for the same behavior, a parent could easily contest that their child was not being treated fairly. This Boys and Girls Club needs one concrete approach to discipline in general and to discipline a bully. Children needed to realize how serious bullying was and exactly what happened if they bullied with no exceptions. Having a structure in place will make students aware that this Boys and Girls Club takes bullying seriously and will make them think twice before they engage in the behavior.

Support

When asked about how the Boys and Girls Club provided support for the victims of bullying and the bullies, the participants gave varied responses. Some staff offered various types of support methods for the victims of bullying, while other staff members had ideas about support for bullies.

Support for victims. MS01handled victims differently than other staff members.

MS01first spoke to the alleged victim of bullying to ensure that they were not doing

anything to provoke the bully. MS01 said, "If I find out that this is a true case of bullying,

I then ask the victim why they think the other students are bullying them." If bullying

was going on, MS01encouraged the victim to use the staff members as a support system.

MS01reiterated, "If children really think they are being bullied, the staff is available to

talk with them, and deal with the bully per Boys and Girls Club rules." MS02 had never

been in a situation where it was necessary to speak to a victim of bullying. MS03 stated,

"I support victims of bullying who report bullying situations by talking to the students

and asking what happened and how I can help." FS01 was not sure how the Boys and

Girls Club dealt with the victims of bullying. FS01 shared, "There is not a support system

in place for the victims of bullying." FS01 said that most staff members made the bully

apologize and asked the victim to tell a staff member if another incident occurred. FS02

stated, "I deal with the victims of bullying by sitting down and talking to the students to

better understand the situation."

FS03 handled the victims of bullying much like MS02. FS03 reacted to the

victims as soon as possible by first investigating to see if the situation was bullying. FS03

shared, "Often children cry bullying when they really do not understand what it means to

be bullied. I ask if a child teased, and if the alleged victim says yes, then I feel

comfortable to discipline the bully." MS04 had a hands-on approach to providing support

for the victims who reported bullying to him, a form of mediation that provided

encouragement and uplift to the student. MS04 assured the students, "Bullying is a

deflection by the other students and is not their fault as the bullies have issues; it was not right for bullies to express their feelings in that manner." MS04 also told victims, "If bullying continues the children could change seating or let a staff member know they needed to move closer to the staff."

FS04 separated the victims and the alleged bullies. FS04 shared, "I usually threaten suspension and remind the students that their parents will not be happy if they had to miss work to pick them up for behavior issues." FS04 continued, "After I take these steps, the victims feel safe because the situation was not ignored." FS05 handled victims of bullying by bringing both parties together and talking to them in front of each other about the incidents. FS05 acknowledged, "I am not sure how the other staff deal with support for victims of bullying; but if my initial approach does not work, then I escort the child to another staff member who might be able to help." FS06 stated, "I deal with victims of bullying by pulling them to the side to assess the situation. I then ask the staff to handle the situation because sometimes the child does want the staff to publicly handle the incident." FS07 stated, "There is not much staff members can do for the victims of bullying but speak to the bully and separate the children so the bullying does not continue." FS07 continued, "I wish staff members could do more, I think we should be trained as counselors in bullying so we could more effectively help the bullied students."

Support for bullies. Only one staff member had insight in terms of support for the bullies that the Boys and Girls Club should provide; none of the staff shared details about the Boys and Girls Club providing support for the bullies. MS01 noted, "Different

Boys and Girls Clubs have varying policies about suspending children for bullying and bad behavior. I do not agree with suspension because putting the children out will not solve the issue." MS01 shared other approaches to support a bully or child with problematic behavior. "In most instances, the child just wants to be active and is expressing it in the wrong way and directing the child's energy is each instructor's responsibility." MS01 stated that the activities the instructor led should be engaging, structured, and interesting. MS01also shared, "Afterschool programs have activities they are less structured or engaging than school activities, and the children are allowed a lot of free play. To prevent bullying, the bully needs to be placed in a different role, such helping staff." MS01continued, "To redirect the behavior of the bullies, staff members need to expose different situations to take their attention away from bullying their peers. With this staff give children a different outlook on how they interact with their peers." One of the main reflections during this interview was whether the support the staff showed the bullies or the victims worked. Other than support, what else did staff members have in place to reduce or eliminate bullying? The next section will look at the bullying policies that the Boys and Girls offered.

Staff Member Insights on How Youth Perceive Bullying

Most staff members shared that youth did not understand the definition of bullying or what actions or behaviors constituted bullying. MS01stated, "Many children claim they are being bullied when they have disagreements with their peers, but I am not sure they really understand what bullying is." MS01noticed, "A kid will accuse someone of bullying because that person will not leave them alone. The children do not realize that

they could have triggered that behavior and are doing the same thing as the "bully." MS01concluded, "Girls in my age group are the main ones to argue about something, get parents involved, and then be friends the next day."

FS02 shared, "Some children do not know what bullying is and that it means picking on someone else. I am surprised they do not consider teasing another student as bullying behavior."

Policy

The staff was asked about the policies related to bullying that the Boys and Girls Club had in place, where staff could access this information, and if the staff members thought the information was sufficient." MS01shared that the bullying policies at the Boys and Girls Club were accessible but need to be updated, renewed and available. MS01 said, "This updated policy should be handed to parents and discussed during orientations. This would ensure that the parents remained in the loop about where the Boys and Girls Club stood with bullying behaviors." MS02 stated, "I am pretty certain that the Club has a policy on bullying. I mean we have the "No Bullying" signs that were posted around the building." MS02 shared they did not take time to show parents the information in the hand book, and did not know where to find that information. "I read over Club policies, but it was a speed read because I have been working with children since 2007, so I am familiar with them and how youth are supposed to behave."

MS02 continued, "I believe that the information the Boys and Girls Club provide about bullying is enough. Also, kids would tell me if another kid was agitating them." In his opinion, the children felt comfortable reporting this information to staff.

MS03 stated that the Boys and Girls Club had a policy in place for bullying. The students received a code of conduct, although the parents did not. Also, the Boys and Girls Club posted flyers on the walls to inform the students that the Club did not tolerate bullying. If parents asked about something specific dealing with policy, the staff member discussed the policy in the code of conduct. Lastly, MS03 shared, "I believe that the information the Boys and Girls Club provides to the staff, members, and parents is sufficient." FS01 stated, "The Boys and Girls Club has zero tolerance for bullying, which is defined by the zero tolerance posters on the wall." FS01 continued, "However, other than the Boys and Girls Club displaying No Bullying Zone posters, there has been no formal written bully policy until I wrote one last year, I assume the Club will adopt it in the coming year." FS01 concluded that staff members let parents know during orientation that there was no bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. FS01 shared, "It bothers me that we do not have a written policy. I do not think this information is sufficient. There are 27 Boys and Girls Clubs in the state, there should be one blanket policy that all Clubs follow."

FS02 shared that the Boys and Girls Club did have a policy, but they had not seen any information about that policy. FS02 said, "I believe that if someone was being bullied, the parents would get a letter informing them about the incident." FS02 continued, "The policy information about bullying is not sufficient and the Boys and Girls Club could offer more training classes because a lot of staff members do not know what bullying means and what it looks like." FS03 shared that the Boys and Girls Club did not have a bullying policy that they were aware of, and said, "if they have one, they

need to do a better job of making sure this information is available for staff, parents, and children." MS04 shared, "I am aware of the parent orientation book, staff member handbook, and standard operating procedures that discuss bullying and tell us how to deal with it." Also, MS04 stated, "There is a zero tolerance of bullying and fighting, but I do not think this is enough. The Boys and Girls Club could go more in-depth with trainings on bullying." FS04 stated, "The Boys and Girls Club has the policies on bullying compiled in a handbook and this handbook is given to parents. When parents fill out paperwork to enroll the students, they could look over the policies." FS04 also shared, "The Boys and Girls Club has a student code in the classroom handbook. I think the information is enough, but there should be a seminar for the children to let them know how serious bullying is."

FS05 acknowledged, "There may have been some written bullying policies in the past, but I have not seen any since working there, and I have been employed 4 months." FS06 answered that the Boys and Girls Club does have a bullying policy in the code of conduct the parents received when the student signed up with the Boys and Girls Club, but commented, "I am not sure that the students receive any type of policy information." FS07 shared, "The policies are in the staff member handbook. Although this information is in the handbook for staff members and in the code of conduct for parents, I do not believe that the policy information on bullying is adequate." FS07 stated, "Policies should be covered in staff training because some staff members brush off bullying and tell the children to just leave it alone. The staff member does not always realize how serious the bullying is." FS07 had a book on bullying, but did not share with another

staff. FS07 said, "I am not sure if the Boys and Girls Club has a written policy, I did not see it in my work papers when I was hired." FS07 continued, "I do not think that the parents receive any type of information about a bullying policy and any information they are given is not sufficient." FS07 stated that the information about bullying was accessible to staff members and parents, but "I don't think students know they have a resource to consult when they encounter bullying." The students could go to a staff member to discuss bullying, but FS07 stated, "I do not believe that solves the issue. It just makes the staff members aware that bullying is going on."

After reviewing the bullying policies of the Boys and Girls Club, one of the thoughts that came to mind was how often does antibullying training occur?

Training

Limber and Small (2003) declared that a provision that mandated training for bullying prevention was essential to the antibullying effort because bullying was distinctive and much different from harassment. During the interviews, I asked the participants about the antibullying training they received at the Boys and Girls Club in terms of frequency and content. The next section described the staff members' responses regarding their opinions about the antibullying training provided at the Boys and Girls Club.

Frequency. During the one-on-one staff member interviews, staff members shared their ideas about different aspects of training as they related to bullying information. Questions I asked were "What was the frequency of the antibullying

training?" And "If there was no training, what were staff members' opinions on what the frequency should be?"

MS01shared that the Boys and Girls Club conducted training on bullying, but the training was mainly for full-time staff. Full-time staff members and directors were trained year round about education and room management in regards to bullying and other youth development topics. Part-time staff members did not receive training as often but attended a major three-day training in August of the previous year called the Three-Day Institute, and bullying was one of the topics covered during this training. MS01 continued, "I feel that bullying should be a training session all by itself and that this training should happen at least quarterly with all staff members attending." MS01 continued, "Prevention and preparedness training on bullying should be done more frequently for part-time staff since part-time staff outnumbered the full-time staff. It would be beneficial to conduct a 5 to 10-minute presentation on bullying prevention during parent orientation." MS01shared, "a lot of staff (part-time and full-time) want to progress in youth development, and I believe training would be a major benefit."

MS02 did not recall if the Boys and Girls Club offered training on bullying. MS02 stated, "Most times I did not pay attention to training by the Boys and Girls Club because I have worked in youth development for over 5 years and I do not need to learn anything new; the information is redundant." MS02 also stated, "Because I have been in youth development for so long I feel that I do not need the training. I would prefer to take a test to demonstrate my knowledge." When asked if there should be more training at the Boys and Girls Club to educate staff members about bullying, MS02 said, "That would

depend on whether the staff member had a lot of youth development experience. If they have experience, then they should not be forced to go to training." However, he noted, "New staff with little-to-no experience should go through a process of training dealing with the negative behaviors associated with bullying." MS03 stated, "The Boys and Girls Club does provide bullying training for the staff on several different topics including bullying. After attending the training, I got a certificate of completion." MS03 shared that the trainings occurred every month, and all staff members were invited to attend. These trainings covered cyberbullying, physical bullying, and verbal bullying, and sometimes the presenter showed videos. MS03 concluded, "I believe the training the staff receives about bullying is sufficient."

FS01 had different views on the frequency and content of the bullying trainings offered at the Boys and Girls Club. FS01 had not attended any training at the Boys and Girls Club in the seven years of employment. FS01 stated, "As far as I know, the Boys and Girls Club does not offer any training of the sort." FS01 continued, "I did get sent to training based on the Olweus Bullying Model that focuses on Bullying preparedness training." FS01 said, "I learned a lot and apply what I learned when dealing with bullying situations at the Boys and Girls Club. The Olweus training helps me to identify the bullies, victims, and bystanders better." FS01 shared an Olweus exercise that she did with the girls to determine which students were bullies, victims, or bystanders. With this exercise, each student identified who they were on the model, and some children identified themselves as the victim of bullying. This exercise effectively helped staff identify the bystanders. FS01 shared, "When there is an incident, I know who to go to

first to find out the truth about the bullying incident." FS01 concluded, "All staff

members do not use this method, but I do and I believe that it would be beneficial for all

staff to receive this bullying preparedness training." I inquired about the cost of the

training. FS01 said "I am not sure, but the Boys and Girls Club have invested in other

trainings, so I do not know why they would not invest in this one."

FS02 had a different perspective on the bully-preparedness training offered at the

Boys and Girls Club. FS02 said that the Boys and Girls Club provided training once a

year and all staff were required to attend. The training discussed bullying, and informed

staff on what bullying was and how to deal with it. There was a discrepancy with this

response; when I asked FS02 if she thought the training was sufficient, she said, "I feel

like there should be a training class to tell staff members how to deal with bullying." This

is a discrepancy because when asked about existing training, she stated, "the Boys and

Girls Club offers training once a year for all staff." FS03 informed me, "The Boys and

Girls Club does not currently offer bullying training, but I think the Boys and Girls Club

should offer workshops and all staff should be required to attend."

MS04 had a similar response to FS03; MS04 stated, "Currently the Boys and

Girls Club does not offer training." This comment was very interesting because FS04 had

been employed at the Boys and Girls Club for five years. MS04 suggested that the Boys

and Girls Club offer bully-preparedness training to the staff. MS04 attended a bullying

training where a presenter spoke about bullying situations in a book she wrote. MS04

said, "The presenter spoke extensively on using an identifier to let people know if they

are the type to stand by and witness the bullying. If these people were identified as

bystanders, they were also a part of the bullying process." MS04 shared, "The Boys and Girls Club should more frequently offer more in-depth training about bullying. The main issue with training is the turnover rate at the Boys and Girls Club and the effect this has on conducting trainings." At that time, the turnover rate for part-time staff was once every other quarter. The employment setting at the Boys and Girls Club consisted of full time permanent staff, regular part-time staff, and temporary part-time staff who were working at the Boys and Girls Club until they found a permanent position. MS04 stated, "It is a silent understanding that the temporary part-time staff will stay for only a short while and might not be employed by the time we had trainings. This could affect the frequency and effectiveness of training because staff might only stay employed with the Boys and Girls Club a couple of months until they found something full time.

FS04 had been employed at the Boys and Girls Club 4 months, and stated, "I am not sure if training was offered, but I am sure they have had something." I feel like we [the Boys and Girls Club] should offer training on bullying for all staff once a year." FS05 stated, "The Boys and Girls Club does not offer any bullying training that I know of but I think they should." FS05 shared, "There are a lot of children who might be dealing with internal problems that are not being expressed and staff should know how to deal with these issues before the situation turns into bullying." FS05 continued, "Children need to be disciplined in different ways, and I think the parents should be involved with the disciplinary process. This would send a message to children about how seriously their actions are being taken by the staff." "Often, children are reprimanded yet came back and

exhibited the same behavior." FS05 concluded, "I believe effective training would remedy this situation."

FS06 said the Boys and Girls Club did offer training once or twice a year, but all staff was not able to attend because the training was held in a different location. The training included a variety of topics including bullying. FS06 believed that this training was not sufficient, "I think the training should be more in-depth and focus on bullying because some staff members brush off bullying incidents and tell the children to handle it by leaving it alone and removing themselves from the person." FS06 did not agree with this approach, "Sometimes the staff members do not know how serious the situation really is, and just blowing the children off is not helping to end the bullying." FS06 concluded, "Training in the Boys and Girls Club with all staff members would be helpful." FS07 had been employed at the Boys and Girls Club for eight months, and stated, "Since I have been working, I have not attended any training on bullying." FS07 had a suggestion about bullying training. FS07 suggested the executive staff select staff members who were designated to be points of contact for bullying reporting. FS07 stated, "Staff should be trained two times a week on bullying and receive a certificate that states that they have been trained to handle bullying situations and are a main contact for the students to talk about bullying." Having a contact onsite would let the students know who was training certified and available for them to report bullying they experienced, witnessed, or engaged in. FS07 suggested, "The bully-certified staff should be a man and a woman, so boy students would feel comfortable going to men staff members and girls could have the option of going to women staff members." After reviewing the bullying

policies and antibullying training, one of the thoughts that came to mind was how many children leave due to bullying, and if the children stay, does the bullying stop? This question will be answered in the next theme about the aftermath of bullying at the Boys and Girls Club.

Bully Aftermath

After staff members discussed the bullying policies at the Boys and Girls Club, I wondered if the policies in place worked and if the bullying stopped. Or did the bullying continue, and did children leave as a result? MS01 stated, "We retain a lot of children at the Boys and Girls Club, and there has not been a dip in attendance since I have been there." MS01shared, "When children hit grades 7 to 8 they do not come as much, and there is a decrease in attendance. Besides that, I have not seen a decrease in attendance, especially related to bullying." MS01shared, "If a bully did not stop after the coaching of the child and a parent conference, then the Boys and Girls Club might not be the place for that particular child."

MS01 admitted, "Unfortunately the Club cannot retain every child. Although we might not be the place for a repeat offender of bullying, I do not think that removing the child from the afterschool environment is the best resolution for bullying issues." He continued, "The child may need more help than we can provide such as therapy or alternatives to the Boys and Girls Club." MS02 stated, "No children have left the Boys and Girls Club since I've been here. However, I do not believe that the bullying consequences that the Boys and Girls Club have in place work". MS02 stated, "A bully always leaves trails, and if they do not have positive people around them, they will

probably continue bullying. Unless there is staff encouraging youth with positive behavior, the child will continue bullying."

MS03 shared, "One child a month leaves the Boys and Girls Club for bullying and other reasons and that these children are mainly young elementary school children." When asked if the consequences the Boys and Girls Club had in place made the bullying stop, MS03 stated "The bullying does stop most of the time, but then the child began bullying again. I notice that youth bullied different participants when they returned." MS03 concluded, "Big children bully small children, vice versa, and boys do not bully girls but girls bully girls." FS01 shared, "In the seven years I've worked here, six children left the Boys and Girls Club. I am not sure if they [children] left for bullying other reasons." FS01 continued, "The youth I supervise stop bullying once I go and deal with the situation, but I cannot speak for the staff on the opposite side of the building." FS01 believed, "Bullying continues with the other staff members because of lack of training. Sometimes the younger staff members just respond to bullying by telling the bully not to hit the child again, instead of following up and investigating the situation." FS01 shared, "I let the kids know that I see their behavior and that I am always watching, and I always followed up with consequences for any behavior that looked like bullying." She continued, "Children are more prone to stop bullying when I used this method. I did not have repeat bullying episodes, but another staff might."

FS02 shared, "A few children left the Boys and Girls Club because they had been bullied and that the consequences the bullies got did not work because the bullying did not stop; bullies just moved on and found the next victim." FS03 had not experienced a

child leaving because of bullying, but shared there was one child who was getting picked on, and he took a break from attending the Boys and Girls Club. FS03 said, "The child went away for a couple of days and came back, but his behavior was horrible he went back and forth with the bully and got in trouble for using inappropriate language towards children who were bullying him." FS03 continued, "Most of the children did stop bullying because being suspended was an inconvenience to the parents." MS04 shared, "Fewer than five students left the Boys and Girls Club because of bullying." MS04 recalled a particular incident, "I remember one particular case when bullying stopped because the child who was doing the bullying was placed on medication. This particular child pushed another child down and split her forehead and the child had to get staples." Due to the nature of the incident, MS04 stated, "I would have preferred that the medication worked and the child to mature before the Boys and Girls Club allowed the child back with the other children."

FS04 shared, "I do not think that children leave the Boys and Girls Club because they are bullied; I think that if the child was being bullied, the problem would be handled by staff." FS04 said staff members did an adequate job of handling bullying issues and if children left the Club, they left for a reason other than bullying. FS04 shared, "However, if the children did not express that they had been bullied, there would probably be a lot of children who left the Boys and Girls Club because of bullying." In addition, FS04 stated, "Children would tell a staff member if someone did something to them. The kids do not hold stuff like that in because they want the culprit to get in trouble at that moment."

FS04 stated, "I feel like the bullying did stop at the Boys and Girls Club once a bully was suspended and re-entered the Boys and Girls Club environment."

FS05 admitted, "I am unsure of how many children left due to bullying because a lot left when they got in trouble, although half of them had a hard time following directions in general, so their leaving might not be bully-related." When asked if the consequences worked and if the bullying stopped, FS05 stated, "A situation like that happened only one time, and the child was not a bully. He was just bad. The child was suspended for three days, and when he returned, he seemed to be all right." FS05 responded, "A lot of children get suspended, then return, mess up again, yet they are still able to come back and attend the Boys and Girls Club." For recurring behaviors, such as these, she said that the children should not be allowed to come anymore as they needed counseling outside of the Boys and Girls Club. FS06 stated, "Since I have been working here, 10 children have left, but this has been during a one-year span." FS06 stated that most of the time the bullying stopped. FS07 admitted, "I am not sure if any child left the Boys and Girls Club because of bullying because I am unsure of how many children attend the Boys and Girls Club right now." Lastly, FS07 stated, "Consequences do not work and write-ups are pointless because the children know that even if they are written up, they could come back to the Boys and Girls Club."

Discrepant Cases

Interview questions aligned with the two research questions posed in the study. Participants were asked 18 open and closed interview questions about what areas peer-to-peer bullying occurred, and what types of bullying occurred and policies and trainings

were in place to minimize bullying at the Boys and Girls Club. Some staff members provided conflicting responses to the interview questions. These responses were considered with the overall data analysis. This discrepant cases were treated just like the supporting data that included recording information objectively free from bias, subjectivity, and assumption.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Reliability was in place to measure the consistency and stability of an assessment tool in research (Creswell, 2014). Reliability in qualitative research was established when the data remained authentic no matter the measurement tool (Creswell, 2014). This strengthened the credibility of the results. Each one-on-one interview was done face to face and audio recorded to increase trustworthiness. Each staff member participant reviewed the interview transcript which I transcribed with the help of a research assistant. After member checking took place, the participants noted no changes in their interviews. Creswell (2014) described this step as a major component to the internal validity process of qualitative research.

Saldana (2009) stated that transferability was achieved when the findings of one study were applied and generalized to another, similar study. A researcher who sought to achieve transferability should be able to trace findings in either direction from the initial research questions, to a conclusion and back when using the same raw data (Saldana, 2009).

Dependability was achieved when research findings were consistent and applied to another study (Shenton, 2004). The content and time frame of the research contributed

to dependable results. It was likely that if this research was replicated following the research design, approach, and with the same data collection methods and sample size, it would yield the same results.

Shenton (2004) stated that to achieve confirmability researchers had to ensure that findings emerged from the actual data and not from their own perceptions. To increase confirmability, I employed a research assistant that reviewed and evaluated the raw data from the audio recordings and hand written notes from the one-on-one interviews to verify participants' responses. After the data were transcribed and reviewed by myself and the research assistant Member checking took place during the interview process and after transcription to decrease subjectivity and to increase research credibility. After each interview, I went over the handwritten notes with each participant to ensure I recorded their responses objectively. After the data were transcribed each participant reviewed the transcription to increase research credibility.

Results

In regards to research question number one: The findings of this research revealed that the Boys and Girls staff members interviewed for this research did not have a uniform understanding of the Boys and Girls Club antibullying policy (i.e., if one existed, where it was located, and who could access it), nor could the staff members collectively provide an answer about the antibullying training the Boys and Girls Club provided in terms of frequency or content.

The staff members were collectively unsure if the Boys and Girls Club had a policy against bullying and where this policy could be accessed by staff, parents, and

children. Many just referred to a general code of conduct, not a specific antibullying policy. As a result, any existing policy did not work. Findings also revealed that the Boys and Girls Club did not have training directly related to bullying, which might have contributed to the reason why staff members and children did not have a concrete definition of bullying. Many times, staff members just viewed teasing as harmless and negative behaviors as horseplay and simply told the children to stop.

In regards to research question number two: Infraction areas where bullying occurred were mainly in the gym or game room areas, and most of the children were comfortable coming to staff to report the bullying. However, there was no formal support system for bullies or victims of bullying.

The findings of this research support the idea that bullying continued to be a problem at this Boys and Girls Club due to a lack of structure, policy implementation, and training. From the data drawn from the participants, the staff members at the Boys and Girls Club did not have a concrete understanding of bullying, they did not receive adequate antibullying training, nor was there a formal policy that addressed bullying.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers from a staff member perspective. This research explored bullying from a staff member perspective. Also, this research involved examining the types of bullying occurring at this Boys and Girls Club, the policies, trainings and practices were in place to minimize bullying, and identified infraction areas where bullying occurred. The results

of this research could potentially open dialogue for an expansion of antibullying

legislation to cover areas where children congregate besides school settings.

Research Question 1 asked what are the types of bullying occurring at this Boys

and Girls Club? What policies, trainings and practices are in place to minimize bullying?

The participants had varied accounts of the antibullying trainings that took place in terms

of if the trainings took place at all and the frequency of the trainings. In addition, they

were contradicting accounts from the 11 staff members on if the Boys and Girls Club had

antibullying policies in place. I found that overall, staff members did not agree with

bullying at the Boys and Girls Club and tried their best to minimize bullying with the

groups they supervised. Research Question 2 asked how can identified "infraction areas"

be safer for participants? Participants responded that the main areas where bullying

occurred were the gym and the game room. These were the areas where children of all

ages engaged in unstructured play and were monitored less by staff members.

Chapter 4 described the data methodology, how the data were organized and

stored, themes uncovered by data collection, and the main findings of the research. For

this qualitative research, 11 participants volunteered and participated in one-on-one

interviews. All participants were staff members of the Boys and Girls Club and over the

age of 18. Chapter 5 will outline the interpretations of the findings, a revisit of

phenomenological theory, the implications for social change, recommendations for

further actions and research, and my reflections.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool centers. While legislation may help to protect students in Kindergarten to twelve grade schools, victims of bullies remained targets in settings outside of these schools (Chandley, 2005). The development of antibullying policies at local afterschool centers is a good start toward eradicating bullying outside of school grounds. However, the lack of formal governmental antibullying policies to include afterschool centers allowed bullying perpetrators in these centers to get away with bullying behaviors with no consequences under state and national law (Mishna, 2003).

The purpose of this qualitative research was to explore bullying at the Boys and Girls Club by conducting one-on-one interviews with Boys and Girls Club staff. With this research, I intended to fill the gap in the literature on bullying to include bullying in afterschool centers and how the lack of knowledge about bullying in these centers affects the antibullying legislation at the state level. Key findings of this research included the following: staff members lack of understanding of the definition of bullying, staff being unaware of a uniform antibullying policy at the Boys and Girls Club, staff collectively not having adequate antibullying training, and the gym and classrooms being the main infraction areas where bullying occurred.

Interpretation of the Findings

This research was intended to explore bullying at the Boys and Girls Club through staff member accounts. Results revealed that participants' perceptions of bullying heavily

influenced how they defined bullying, and each participant looked at bullying slightly differently. In addition, participants shared that the students at the Boys and Girls Club did not have a clear understanding of the types of bullying nor when children were engaging in bullying behaviors. Results showed that some victims exhibited certain characteristics that might make them a target for bullies, such as being perceived by peers to be weird and quiet. Students who were classified as bullies were characterized as the ringleaders of conflict and tended to sometimes play the role of the bully and sometimes the victim. Research Question 2 asked staff to identify the infraction areas. The main physical spaces where bullying occurred were the gym and the game room. Children of all ages engaged in unstructured play and were monitored less by staff members in these areas.

Results also showed that bullies did not report their own bullying behavior and that most of the reports about bullying came from witnesses or victims. Results revealed that overall the staff members at this Boys and Girls Club utilized the same disciplinary method, but all staff members did not implement the disciplinary procedure in the same sequential order. The disciplinary steps that the Boys and Girls Club had in place were mediation, write-up, call to parents, suspension, and then, if necessary, expulsion. Results showed that the Boys and Girls Club did not have a formal support system in place for the victims of bullying or the bullies.

Results showed that this Boys and Girls Club did not have any specific policy or training specifically related to bullying. Due to the lack of antibullying policy and training at this Boys and Girls Club, there was nothing in place to prevent, combat, or

ensure that bullying would not occur repeatedly. These findings confirmed and extended

the knowledge in peer-to-peer bullying and demonstrated that bullying was most

prevalent among middle school children, most bullying was done verbally, and staff

members (teachers) still struggled with understanding the concept of bullying, how to

minimize bullying, and the most effective way to treat bullies and bullying victims.

Limitations of the Study

There were not that many limitations to the study, but they still need to be

considered to understand the research. One of the main limitations of this was that data

were collected at only one afterschool center. In addition, data collected were from staff

only, and no data were collected from students on their experiences with bullying at the

Boys and Girls Club. Another limitation was that the sample size of eligible participants

fell short of what I originally considered. Although this Boys and Girls club had around

13 staff members, only 11 agreed and were of age (18 years old) to participate in the

research. The purpose of this research was to explore bullying behaviors in afterschool

centers. This research also explored the type, frequency, and infraction areas of bullying

behaviors in afterschool centers. This research had the potential to influence policy

making on the local level as it pertains to expanding the antibullying laws to include

afterschool centers.

Recommendations

One of the main recommendations for this Boys and Girls Club is multiday

antibullying training. Each Boys and Girls Club staff member should attend trainings

designed by Olweus, the antibullying pioneer, for a foundation in combating peer-to-peer

bullying. Next, this Boys and Girls Club should implement concrete antibullying policies and update the Code of Conduct with these policies to deter bullying. The club needs to review these policies with staff, children, and parents at least twice a year, and they should be easily located by staff members and children.

The next recommendation is for the Boys and Girls Club to determine which age groups engage in the most bullying. This can be accomplished by administering a modified version of the School Climate Bullying Survey by Dewey Cornell called the Authoritative School Climate Survey (Cornell, 2015). This tool measures bullying by age groups and grades, so the staff member could see which age groups engage in the most bullying. After examining the data, the Boys and Girls Club can create programs to target the bullying behaviors amongst each age group.

The final recommendation is for this Boys and Girls Club to have a formal disciplinary method in place when children report bullying to staff. If found guilty of engaging in bullying behaviors, students will be suspended and have their names added to a log along with explanations of the bullying situation, how the bullying was reported, and the disciplinary action taken by staff. This information can be kept by the executive director to track repeat offenders, target these individuals for interventions, and discover which children may need extra guidance and support.

The findings of this research indicated that bullying did, in fact, occur at this afterschool center, and those findings may initiate dialogue about the importance of having antibullying policies within afterschool centers. An influx of literature in this area may yield data that persuade legislatures and support the idea that antibullying laws

should be expanded to include afterschool centers and other areas where children

congregate besides school. This policy expansion could provide consequences for

children found guilty of bullying, and these consequences could act as a deterrent and

help protect students who attend afterschool centers.

Implications for Social Change

The idea for this research started as a question: Could I survive in school today

with the prevalence of bullying? As I began to explore the various types of bullying, the

research highlighted the toll of bullying that has in some instances taken the lives of

children as young as 9 years old. Even more alarming was the fact that some states have

legislation that deals with bullying while others do not, and bullying does not stop on

school grounds. Parents send children to afterschool centers so they can have structured,

engaged activity afterschool while the parents are still at work. Parents believe that they

are sending their children to a safe place when bullying exists in these places as well.

This research fills a gap in the bullying literature by exploring places where

children congregate outside of schools. The hope is that this research will begin dialogue

regarding the need for further research as well as promote structured antibullying

programs in afterschool centers. On a national level, I hope that research like this and

future studies get the attention of policy makers so they can begin to take a serious look

at policy expansion. States that have existing antibullying legislation should examine the

presence of bullying in afterschool centers and formulate policies that address this issue.

As of right now, a bully can torment a child at an afterschool center with no legal

ramifications because there is no national policy or state policy in place that addresses

bullying that occurs at afterschool centers. The social change I would like to see is awareness of bullying at afterschool centers, structured antibullying programs at these afterschool centers, and policy expansion to afterschool centers.

Conclusion

Peer-to-peer bullying is a significant public health problem that negatively impacts about 20% of school aged children annually (CDC, 2016). Around 160,000 children stay home from school each day to avoid being bullied (CDC, 2016). Bullying that occurs in the classroom or on school grounds has been widely studied. States have enacted antibullying legislation to address bullying on school grounds. Despite legislation, bullying continued to be prevalent among school age children (CDC, 2016). Children are bullied physically, verbally, sexually, and socially, on the Internet, and some are bullied to the extent that they take their own life.

Over the years, understanding of bullying has expanded; roles of the bully, victim, bystander, and bully victim have been defined. However, this research is only applicable to school settings, and study of bullying in areas outside of school premises where children congregate had been limited. One area where children daily congregate outside of the classroom are afterschool centers, and the Boys and Girls Club is a well-known organization that offers afterschool programming for school age children. The results of this exploratory research showed that bullying did exist in an afterschool center, specifically the Boys and Girls Club.

More empirical research is needed to understand if bullying occurred at just the Boys and Girls Club or if bullying behaviors existed at other afterschool centers such as

the YMCA. Also, empirical research is further needed to determine if peer-to-peer

bullying at afterschool centers occurred in other regions of the United States. There were

inconsistencies in participants' responses about the existence of an antibullying policy

and antibullying training at this Boys and Girls Club. This shed light that staff members

did not have a uniform knowledge on resources such as training and policies to help them

deal with bullying at the Boy and Girls Club. The program director was the only person

interviewed who had accurate information about antibullying policies and information on

training.

It is justifiable to say that bullying does occur at this Boys and Girls Club and the

staff members need to come up with a bullying policy that is comprehensive and

accessible to staff members, children, and parents. This Boys and Girls Club needs to

also offer extensive antibullying training at least twice a year for all staff.

In this chapter, I summarized the results of this research, presented the findings,

and provided an interpretation of the data. I also discussed the implications for social

change, the limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research. This

research contributed to the field of knowledge on peer-to-peer bullying behaviors

amongst school aged children and provides state legislators increased knowledge on

bullying that occurs outside of school settings.

References

Afterschool Alliance. (2009). Georgia after 3 p.m. Retrieved from

   http://www.afterschoolalliance.org

Afterschool Alliance. (2011). Afterschool programs: Making a difference in America's

   communities by improving academic achievement, keeping kids safe and helping

   working families. Retrieved from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org

Afterschool Alliance. (2012a). About the Afterschool Alliance. Retrieved from

   http://www.afterschoolalliance.org

Afterschool Alliance. (2012b). Evaluations backgrounder: A summary of formal

   evaluations of afterschool programs' impact on academics, behavior, safety, and

   family life. Retrieved from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org

Afterschool programs. (2004, August 3). *Education Week.* Retrieved from

   http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/afterschool-programs/

Alexander, B. (2015, March 21). Monica Lewinsky talk hits cyber bullying. *USA Today*.

   Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/

Axon, S. (2010). MTV unleashes an iPhone app to combat bullying. Retrieved from

   http://mashable.com/2010/10/04/mtv-over-the-line-bullying-app/

Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson

   Wadsworth.

Badertscher, N. (2010, March 30). Antibullying bill passes house. *The Atlanta Journal*

   Constitution. Retrieved from http://www.ajc.com/

Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: Transcribing. *Oxford Journals*

Family Practice, 25(2), 127-131. Retrieved from

https://academic.oup.com/fampra

Baker, C., Wuest, J., & Noerager, P. S. (1992). Method slurring: The grounded

theory/phenomenological example. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 17*, 1355-1360.

doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.1992.tb01859.x

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and

implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559.

Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/

Berkey, L. G., Keyes, B. J., & Longhurst, J. E. (2001). Bully-proofing: What one district

learned about improving school climate. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 9*(4),

224-229. Retrieved from http://www.youthpolicy.org/academic-journals/

Bernardo, R. (2015). 2015's best & worst states at controlling bullying. Retrieved from

http://wallethub.com/edu/best-worst-states-at-controlling-bullying/9920/#main-

findings

Berthold, K. A. (1996). *Bullying: Perceptions of students in Grades 4-6 in a mid-sized*

Midwestern public school district (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University

of North Dakota.

Blanco, J. (2008). *Please stop laughing at us…One survivor's extraordinary quest to*

prevent school bullying. Dallas, TX: BenBella Books.

Boone, C., & Morris, M. (2010, November 8). Witnesses describe fatal beating of

Douglasville teen. *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*. Retrieved from

http://www.ajc.com/

Brown, W. O., Frates, S. B., Rudge, I. S., & Tradewell, R. L. (2002). *The costs and benefits of afterschool programs: The estimated effects of the Afterschool Education and Safety Program Act of 2002*. Retrieved from http://www.middlechildhoodmatters.ca/

Bully Police USA. (2015). Georgia. Retrieved from http://www.bullypolice.org

Bullying Statistics. (2009a). Bullying and suicide. Retrieved from http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/bullying-and-suicide.html

Bullying Statistics. (2009b). Bullying laws. Retrieved from http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/bullying-laws.html

Bullying Statistics. (2009d). Bullying statistics 2010. Retrieved from http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/bullying-statistics-2010.html

Bullying Statistics (2009c). Olweus bullying prevention program. Retrieved from http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/olweus-bullying-prevention-program.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Connectedness as a strategic direction for the prevention of suicidal behavior. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). Understanding bullying fact sheet. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/

Cerda´, M., Messner, S. F., Tracy, M., Vlahov, D., Goldmann, E., Tardiff, K. J., & Galea, S. (2010). Investigating the effect of social changes on age-specific gun-related

homicide rates in New York City during the 1990s. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*(6), 1107-1115. Retrieved from http://ajph.aphapublications.org/

Chandley, B. S. (2005). *A qualitative study: Gendered perceptions of bullying among adolescents at a Boys and Girls Club* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.

Clark, M. (2013). 49 States now have anti bullying laws. How's that working out? Retrieved from http://www.governing.com/news/headlines

Cohen, A. (2011, September 6). Why New Jersey's antibullying law should be a model for other states. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from http://ideas.time.com

Cohen, M. A., Piquero, A. R. (2009). New evidence on the monetary value of saving a high-risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *25*, 25-49. doi:10.1007/s10940-008-9057-3

Cooper, A. (2012, March 16). Hostin: Ravis trial is a wakeup call [Video file]. Retrieved from http://ac360.blogs.cnn.com/category/bullying/

Cowie, Helen. (2014). Understanding the role of bystanders and peer support in school bullying. *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, *6*(1), 26-32. Retrieved from https://www.um.edu.mt/ijee

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710–722. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.ep9506152720.

Crockett, D. (2003). Critical issues children face in the 2000s. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *18*(4), 446-453. Retrieved from http://naspjournals.org/

Dake, J. A., Price, J. H. & Telljohann, S. K. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *Journal of School Health*, *73*(5), 173-180. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/journals/j-sch-health/

Dellasega, C., & Adamshick, P. (2005). Evaluation of a program designed to reduce relational aggression in middle school girls. *Journal of School Violence, 4(*3), 63-76. doi:10.1300/J202v04n03_06

Deviller, D., Hosein, S., & Kipner, S. (2002). Stole. [Recorded by Kelly Rowland] On *Simply Deep* [CD]. Hollywood, CA: Columbia.

Dickson, M. (2010, June 13). Research finds bullying link to child suicides. *The Independent.* Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/research-finds-bullying-link-to-child-suicides-1999349.html

Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*(6), 1146-1158. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1146

Dorning, A. (2009, November 17). Antibullying efforts gain in Mass. *ABC World News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/

Dragan, E. F. (2011). *The Bully action guide: How to help your child and get your school to listen*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillian.

Eaton, D. K., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S., Flint, K. H., Hawkins, J., Wechsler, H. (2012, June 2012). Youth risk behavior surveillance. *Surveillance Summaries*

61(SS04), 1-162. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/

Eckholm, E. (2011, May 4). Two students plead guilty in bullying teenager. *The New York Times*, A25. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/

Eddins, G. (2005). The virtual Y afterschool program. A ray of sunshine for urban elementary school children. A summary of seven years of program evaluation. New York: YMCA of Greater New York

Elias, M. J., & Zinsd, J. E. (2003). Bullying, other forms of peer harassment, and victimization in schools. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*(2), 1-5. doi:10.1300/J008v19n02_01

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 365-383. Retrieved from http://naspjournals.org/loi/spsr

Farrington, D. P. & Ttofi, M. M. (2009a). How to reduce school bullying? *Victims and Offenders*, 4, 321-326. doi:10.1080/15564880903227255.

Farrington, D. P. & Ttofi, M. M. (2009b). School- based programs to reduce bullying and victimization. Systematic review for the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/

Filgo, J., Filgo, Je., Sachs, G., & Judah, J. (Producers), & Thor Freudenthal. (Director). (2010, March 19). *Diary of a Wimpy Kid* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Fonagy, P., & Twemlow, S. W. (2005). The prevalence of teachers who bully students in schools with differing levels of behavioral problems. *American Journal of*

Psychiatry, 162(12), 2387-2389. doi 10.1176/appi.ajp.162.12.2387

Frieden, T. R., Jaffe, H. W., Cono, J., Richards, C. L., Iademarco, M. F. (2016, June 10).

    Youth risk behavior surveillance- United States 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality*

    Weekly Report, 65(6), 1-180. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/

Froeschle, J. G., Mayorga, M., Castillo, Y., & Hargrave, T. (2008). Strategies to prevent

    and heal the mental anguish caused by cyberbullying. *Middle School Journal,*

    39(4), 30-35. Retrieved from http://www.nmsa.org/

Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network. (2009, July 8). Sirdeaner Walker

    testimony at strengthening school safety through prevention of bullying hearing.

    Retrieved from http://www.glsen.org/

Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network. (2017). Our mission. Retrieved from

    http://www.glsen.org/

Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network. (2017a). States with safe schools.

    Retrieved from http://www.glsen.org/

Georgia Afterschool Investment Council. (2007). The current state of afterschool in

    Georgia: Building a strong foundation. Retrieved from http://www.guidestar.org/

Georgia Department of Education. (2011). The Georgia Bullying Law. Retrieved from

    http://archives.doe.k12.ga.us/

Georgia Municipal Association. (2010, Jan 25). City Leaders Sing Praises of Afterschool

    programs. Retrieved from http://www.gmanet.com/

Girl Scout Research Institute. (2008). Sister to sister the darker side of friendship.

    Retrieved from http://www.girlscouts.org/

Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., Lumpkin, C. D. (2013).

Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and

recommended data elements, Version 1.0. Atlanta, GA; National Center for Injury

Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and U.S.

Department of Education. Retrieved from

https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1978). *The discovery of grounded theory strategies for

qualitative research*. New York, NY: Aldine Transaction.

Gorta, W.J. (2002, Nov 8). Anti-crime study boosts afterschool programs. Retrieved from

http://nypost.com/

Governor Signs Antibullying Legislation. (2010, May 27). Retrieved from

http://www.georgia.govstate.gov/

Green, E. G. T., Thomsen, L., Sidanius, J., Staerkle, C., & Potanina, P. (2009). Reactions

to crime as a hierarchy regulating strategy: The moderating role of social

dominance orientation. *Soc Just Res, 22*, 416–436. doi:10.1007/s11211-009-0106-

3

Greene, M. B. (2006). Bullying in schools: A plea for measure of human rights. *Journal

of Social Issues, 62(1), 63-79.* doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00439.x

Hadad, C. (2011, October 11). CNN Study: Schoolyard bullies not just preying on the

weak. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/

Haeseler, L. A. (2010). Stopping child bullying: Educators' diverse approaches for school

improvement. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 20, 952-

962. doi:10.1080/10911359.2010.500923

Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., & Turner, H. (2013) Perpetrator and victim gender patterns for 21 forms of youth victimization in the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence. *Violence and Victims, 28,* 915-939. Retrieved from http://www.springerpub.com/violence-and-victims.html

Hayes, A. (2012, May 21). Prosecutors to appeal 30-day sentence in Rutgers gay bullying case. CNN Justice. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/

Hertz, M. F., Donato, I., & Wright, J. (2013). Bullying and suicide: A public health approach. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53, S1-S3. Retrieved from http://www.jahonline.org/

Hertzog, J. (2011, Oct 14). Bullying is not a rite of passage. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/14/opinion/hertzog-bullying/

Hibbard, L. (2011, September 22). Lady gaga vows to make bullying illegal. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/22/lady-gaga-vows-to-make-bu_n_975852.html

High, B. (2007). *Bullycide in America: moms speak out about the bullying*. Darlington, MD: JBS Publishing, Inc.

High school classmates say gunman was bullied. (2007, April 19). MSNBC News Retrieved from http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/18169776/ns/us_news-crime_and_courts/t/high-school-classmates-say-gunman-was-bullied/#.TwdSXVbDeyA

Holt, M. K., Kantor, G. K, & Finkelhor, D. (2009). Parent/Child concordance about

bullying involvement and family characteristics related to bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of School Violence*, 8(42), 42–63. doi:10.1080/15388220802067813

Hong, J. S., Cho, H., & Lee, A. S. (2010). Revisiting the Virginia tech shootings: An ecological systems analysis. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 15, 561-575. doi:10.1080/15325024.2010.519285

Huffington Post Gay Voices. (2013, January 29). Jadin Bell, gay Oregon teen, taken off life support after hanging himself. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/29/jadin-bell-gay-oregon-teen-hanging-suicide-life-support-_n_2576404.html

Huffington Post. (2012, April 18). Sawyer Rosenstein, New Jersey middle school student, nets $4.2 million settlement for bully's paralyzing punch. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/18/nj-bullys-paralyzing-punc_n_1435176.html

Ives, B. (Producer). (2011, October, 28). *Frank and Wanda Show* [Radio broadcast]. Atlanta, GA: V-103

James, S. D. (2011, September 22). Jamey Rodemeyer suicide: Police consider criminal bullying charges. *ABC News Health*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/Health/jamey-rodemeyer-suicide-ny-police-open-criminal-investigation/story?id=14580832

Jeynes, W. H. (2008). Effects of parental involvement on experiences of discrimination and bullying. *Marriage and Family Review, 43*(3/4), 255-268.

doi:10.1080/01494920802072470

Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying Among Young Adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics*, 112, 1231-1237. Retrieved from http://www.jpeds.com/

Kanaracus, C. (2010, September 3). School uses anti bullying app after suicide. Retrieved from http://www.pcworld.com/

Kaplan, B., & Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research methods for evaluating computer information systems, in evaluating the organizational impact of healthcare information systems.* New York, NY: Springer.

Kemmelmeier, M. (2006). The effects of race and social dominance orientation in simulated juror decision making. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(5), 1030-1045. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02158.x

Kennedy, H. (2010, March 29). Phoebe Prince, South Hadley high school's 'new girl,' driven to suicide by teenage cyber bullies. Retrieved from http://articles.nydailynews.com/2010-03-29/news/27060348_1_facebook-town-hall-meetings-school-library

Kimmel, M. S., Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity homophobia and violence: Random school shootings 1982-2001. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(10), 1439-1458. doi:10.1177/0002764203251484

Kiriakidism, S. P. (2008). Bullying and suicide attempts among adolescents kept in custody. *Crisis, 29*(4), 216-218. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/cri/

Kolbert, J. B., Crothers, L. M., & Field, J. E. (2006). Adolescent females' attraction to male adolescent bullies and victims of bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 5*(1), 81-91. doi:10.1300/J202v05n01_06

Kolonder. M. (2010, February 23). Mom claims kindergarten bullies at Brooklyn's PS 161 punched daughter, 5 and cut off her hair. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from http://articles.nydailynews.com/2010-02-23/local/27057010_1_hair-classroom-kindergarten

Kueny, M. T., & Zirkel, P. A. (2012). An analysis of school antibullying laws in the United States. *Middle School Journal,* 43(4), 22-31. Retrieved from http://www.amle.org/

Lareya, S. T., Copeland, W. E., Costello, E. J., & Wolke, D. (2015, June 22). Adult mental health consequences of peer bullying and maltreatment in childhood: two cohorts in two countries. *Mental Health Weekly Digest, 35*. Retrieved from http://www.mentalhealthweeklynews.com/

Leung, C., & To, H. (2009). The relationship between stress and bullying among secondary school students. *New Horizons in Education, 57*(1), 33-42. Retrieved from http://www.scpe.ied.edu.hk/newhorizon/

Limber, S. P., & Small, M. A. (2003). State laws and policies to address bullying in schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 445–455. Retrieved from http://naspjournals.org/

Losey, R. A. (2009). An evaluation of the Olweus bullying prevention program's effectiveness in a high school setting. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13*(6), 522-525. Retrieved from www.fampra.oxfordjournals.org

Martin, C. L. (1995). Stereotypes about children with traditional and nontraditional gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 33(11/12), 727–751. Retrieved from http://www.springer.com/us/

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.

McCoy, B. (2011, September 26). Largest campaign yet to stop bullying in Nevada schools. Retrieved from http://www.ktnv.com/news/local/130614353.html

McEvoy, A. (2005). Teachers who bully students: Patterns and policy implications. Persistently Safe Schools 2005: The National Conference of the Hamilton Fish Institute on school and Community Violence. Retrieved from http://stopbullyingnowfoundation.org/main/

McQueen, A. (2010, September 11). Survey: Many youngsters home alone afterschool. *ABC News/Health*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/Health/story?id=117979&page=1

Messias, E., Kindrick, K., & Castro, J. (2014). School bullying, cyberbullying, or both: Correlates of teen suicidality in the 2011 CDC youth risk behavior survey. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 55*. 1063-1068. Print.

Michaels, L. (Producer), & Waters, M. (Director). (2004). *Mean girls* [Motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.

Michaels, S. (2011, September 23). Lady Gaga to meet with Obama over bullying. *The Guardian UK*. Retrieved from www.guardian.co.uk

Mikami, A. Y., Szwedo, D. E., Allen, J. P., Evans, M. A., & Hare. A. L. (2010). Adolescent peer relationships and behavior problems predict young adults' communication on social networking websites. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(1), 46-56. doi:10.1037/a0017420

Miles, M. B., & Hubberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mishna, F. (2003). Peer victimization: The case for social work intervention. *Families in Society*, *84*(4), 513-522. Retrieved from http://alliance1.org/fis

Mom: School bullying led to 11-year old's suicide. (2009, April 20). Retrieved on August 8, 2011 from http://www.wsbtv.com/news/19233010/detail.html

Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L. A., & Unger, J. B. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence*, 39(154), 315-335. Retrieved from https://www.ebscohost.com/

Murphy, K. (2014). Feb 9th is Stop Bullying Day. Retrieved from http://www.wboc.com/story/28060557/feb-9-is-stop-bullying-day

Natvig, G. K., Grethe, A., & Ulla, Q. (2001). School-Related stress experience as a risk factor for bullying behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30*(5), 561-575. doi:10.1023/A: 1010448604838.

No Bullying. (2015a). School bullying. Retrieved from http://nobullying.com/school-bullying/

No Bullying. (2015b). The complicated web of teen lives: 2015 Bullying report.

Retrieved from http://nobullying.com/the-complicated-web-of-teen-lives-2015-

bullying-report/

No Bullying. (2015c). Zelda Williams quits Twitter, Cyber bullied over father's passing.

Retrieved from http://nobullying.com/zelda-williams-quits-twitter/

Ockerman, M.S., Kramer, C., & Bruno, M. (2014). From the School yard to cyberspace:

A pilot study of bullying behaviors among middle school students. *Research in

Middle Level Education, 37*(6), 1-18. Retrieved from http://www.amle.org/

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Company.

Olweus, D. (2005). A useful evaluation design and effects of the Olweus Bullying

Prevention Program. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *11*(4), 389-402.

doi:10.1080/10683160500255471

Olweus Bullying Prevention Program [OBPP]. (2011). Violence Prevention Works: Safer

Schools Safer Communities. Retrieved from

http://www.violencepreventionworks.org/

Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights National Bullying Prevention Center.

(2011). October is national bullying prevention month. Retrieved from

http://www.pacer.org/

Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights National Bullying Prevention Center.

(2015). Bullying statistics. Retrieved from http://www.pacer.org/bullying/

Page, B. (2007, December 3). The teacher as a bully. *Education News*. Retrieved from

http://www.educationnews.org/articles/the-teacher-as-bully.html

Pellegrini, A. D., & Bartini, M. (2001). Dominance in early adolescent boys: Affiliative

and aggressive dimensions and possible functions. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*,

47(1), 142-163. Retrieved from http://www.wsupress.wayne.edu/

Peskin, M. F., Tortolero, S. R., & Markham, C. M. (2006), Bullying and victimization

among Black and Hispanic adolescents. *Adolescence, 41*(163), 467-484.

Retrieved from https://www.ebscohost.com/

Phillips, R. (2010). The financial costs of bullying, violence, and vandalism. Retrieved

from http://www.nassp.org

Project Exploration. (2012). Changing the face of science. Retrieved from

http://www.projectexploration.org/

Public/Private Ventures. (2012, Dec 3). 2011 Annual report- picturing success: The

transformative power of afterschool. Retrieved from http://ppv.issuelab.org/

Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, & Snyder, T. (2012). Indicators of school crime safety.

Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). Understanding women's risk for HIV infection

using social dominance theory and the four bases of gendered power. *Psychology

of Women Quarterly, 34*(1), 21-35. Retrieved from https://us.sagepub.com/en-

us/nam/psychology-of-women-quarterly/journal202010

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* London, UK: Sage

Publications.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Combining qualitative and quantitative sampling, data

collection, and analysis techniques in mixed-method studies. *Research in Nursing*

and Health, 23, 246-255. Retrieved from http://www.hrpub.org/

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing and Health, 18(*2), 179-183. doi:10.1002/nur.4770180211

Schafer, M., Korn, S., Smith, P., Hunter, S., Mora-Merchan, J., Singer, M., & Van der Meulen, K. (2004). Lonely in the crowd: Recollections of bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22, 379-394. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/

Schmitt, M. T., & Wirth, J. H. (2009). Evidence that gender differences in social dominance orientation result from gendered self-stereotyping and group-interested responses to patriarchy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*(4), 429-436. Retrieved from https://www.ebscohost.com/

Seeds, P, M., Harkness, K. L., & Quilty, L.C. (2010). Parental maltreatment, bullying, and adolescent depression: Evidence for the mediating role of perceived support. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *39*(5), 681-692. doi:10.1080/15374416.2010.501289

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects, 22. Retrieved from http://www.crec.co.uk/

Shipman, G. (2012). What can bystanders do to prevent bullying of students who are different or perceived as different from others? Treat bullying as the sickness it is. *English Journal*, *101*(6), 28-29. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/journals/ej

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sidorowicz, K., Hair, E. C., & Milot, A. (2009, October). *Assessing bullying: A guide for out of school time program practitioners*. Retrieved from the Child Trends website: https://www.childtrends.org/

Silva, M. A., Pereira, B., Mendonca. D., Nunes, B., & Abadio de Oliveria, W. (2013). The involvement of girls and boys in bullying: An analysis of gender differences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 10,* 6820-6831. Retrieved from http://www.mdpi.com/journal/ijerph

Silverman, R. E. (2013). How workplace bullies get ahead. *The Wall Street Journal.* Retrieved from http://. wsj.com/

Simmons, D. (2010). D.C. mulls antibullying law: Gays included in protection. *The Washington Times.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/28/dc-mulls-antibullying-law/?page=all

Stomp Out Bullying. (2011). Forms of bullying. Retrieved from http://www.stompoutbullying.org/

Stomp out bullying. (2015). The issue of bullying. Retrieved from http://www.stompoutbullying.org/

Smokowski, P. R., & Kopasz, K. H. (2005). Bullying in school: An overview of the types, effects, family characteristics, and intervention strategies. *Children and Schools, 27*(2), 101-110. Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/cs

Superville, D. (10, March 2011). Obama to victims: I know what it's like. Retrieved from http://www.havredailynews.com/cms/news/story-220651.html.

Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W. S. (2008). "You're so gay": Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, *37*(2), 160-173. Retrieved from https://www.ebscohost.com/

Temkin, D. (2012, Oct 2). A History of Bullying Prevention Month. Retrieved from http://www.stopbullying.gov/

Terry, T. M. (2010). Blocking the bullies: Has South Carolina's safe school climate act made public schools safer? *The Clearing House*, *83*, 96–100. doi:10.1080/00098651003655902

The Boys and Girls Club. (2016). The Boys and Girls Club of metro Atlanta. Retrieved from http://www.bgcma.org

The Bullying Project. (2010). The Bullying project: Exploring peer aggression. Retrieved from http://bullyingproject.com/

The Tyler Clementi Foundation. (2016). Tyler's story. Retrieved from http://tylerclementi.org/

Theriot, M. T., Dulmus, C. N., Sowers, K. M., & Bowie, S. L. (2004). The criminal bully-linking criminal peer bullying behavior in schools to a continuum of delinquency. *Journal of Evidence Based Social Work*, *1*(2/3), 77-92. doi:10.1300/J394v1n02_06

Thornberg, R., & Knutse, S. (2011). Teenagers' explanations of bullying. *Child Youth Care Forum, 40*, 177-192. doi:10.1007/s10566-010-9129-z

Trach, J., Hymel, S., Waterhouse, T. & Neale, K. (2010). Bystander responses to school bullying: Across- sectional investigation of grade and sex differences. *Canadian*

*Journal of School Psychology, 25(1),*114-130. Retrieved from

http://journals.sagepub.com/home/cjs

Tresniowski, A. (2009, May 18). Two boys, two towns, two tragedies: Bullied to death?

People. Retrieved from http://people.com/archive/two-boys-two-towns-two-

tragedies-bullied-to-death-vol-71-no-19/

Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to

reduce bullying: a systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental*

Criminology, 7(1), 27-56. doi 10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

University of Buffalo News Center. (2011, September 23). Gaga's anti bullying stance

can help, says expert. Retrieved from www.buffalo.edu/news/12902

University of California Irvine. (2012). Afterschool outcome measures project. Retrieved

from http://www.gse.uci.edu/

Virginia Tech Review Panel (2007, April 16). Mass shootings at Virginia Tech.

Retrieved from http://www.ipfw.edu/

Walcott, C. M., Upton, A., Bolen, L. M., & Brown, M. B. (2008). Associations between

peer-perceived status and aggression in young adolescents. *Psychology in the*

Schools, 45(6), 550-561. doi:10.1002/pits.20323

Weddle, D. B., & New, K. E. (2011). What did Jesus do? Answering religious

conservatives who oppose bullying prevention legislation. *New England Journal*

on Criminal and Civil Confinement, *37*, 325-347. Retrieved from

https://www.nesl.edu/practical-experiences/law-review

Welsh, E. (2002). Dealing with data: Using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis

process. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 3*(2), 1-9. Retrieved from

http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs

Wiid, J., & Diggines, C. (2009). *Marketing research*. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta and

Company Ltd.

Willard, N. (2007). Cyberbullying: Q&A with Nancy Willard. *The Prevention*

Researcher, 14(5), p. 13-15. Retrieved from http://www.tpronline.org

Williams, K. R. & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying.

Journal of Adolescent Health 41, 14-21. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018

Wolfe, D.A., Crooks, C.C., Chiodo, D., & Jaffe, P. (2009). Child maltreatment, bullying,

gender- based harassment, and adolescent dating violence: Making the

connections. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*(1), 21-24. Retrieved from

http://journals.sagepub.com/home/pwq

Woodger, B. (June 8, 2011). Weybridge mother launches anti bullying phone app.

Retrieved from

http://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/s/2094091_weybridge_mother_launches_anti

bullying_phone_app

Youth Violence. (2011). Youth Violence a report of the surgeon general. Retrieved from

http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/youthviolence/chapter5/appendix5b.html#

Bullying

Zweig, J. M. Dank, M., Lachman, P., & Yahner, J. (2013). Technology, Teen Dating

Violence and Abuse, and Bullying. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/

Appendix A: Informational Meeting Flyer

Would you like to participate in a bullying study at the BGC?

Researcher

Doctoral Student

Who:

Staff members of the BGC 18 years of age and older.

What:

A Study about bullying at the BGC

When:

Staff are asked to attend one **Informational Meeting on April 16, 2014**

Time: 6:15pm

Place: Education room at BGC

This meeting is optional and will be held in the Education classroom.

During this meeting staff will learn about the study and complete consent forms if they decide they want to participate in the study. Consent forms can also be emailed to the researcher. Or returned to the researcher in person..

Contact Information

Bullying Zero Tolerance

say no to bullying

Appendix B: Staff Questionnaire

Bullying Study

Staff Questionnaire

1) What age range are you?

- 18-26

- 27-35

- 36-45

- 46-55

- 55+

2) How long have you been employed at this Boys and Girls Club?

3) What age group do you primarily work with?

4) Do the age groups you work with have conflict amongst each other? If so, what issues cause the most conflict?

5) How many physical fights would you say occur with the age groups you work with in the past month?

6) Do you hear of many children being bullied in the age group you work with? If so How do you hear these conversations? Do students come up to you or do you approach them?

7) About how many bullying incidences would you say occur in your Club in a given month?

8) Would you say that children feel comfortable coming to you to tell about another student that has bullied them physically, teased them or text or put information on the

Internet that was harmful and hurtful?

9) Can you describe a situation where a student has come to you to report or tell you something that has happened to them while at the club in terms of bullying?

10) Where at the Boys and Girls Club does most of the bullying that you have witnessed or that students report to you occur? In the bathrooms, hallways, classrooms, outside, in the eating area?

11) How does your Club deal with students who bully? How do they deal with students who have been bullied?

12) Does your Club have a written policy or information about bullying that is made accessible to students, parents, and other staff? If so, do you think the information the Club has about bullying is sufficient?

13) If not, do you think that your Club should make this information accessible?

14) Does your Club offer bullying preparedness and prevention training to staff on how to deal with bullies and victims of bullying? If so, what does the training entail?

15) If not, do you feel as though your Club should offer bullying preparedness and prevention training?

16) In your estimation, how many children who are bullied leave the club?

17) Are there consequences to those who do the bullying?

18) Do these consequences work? --does the bullying stop?