Elementary Principals' Perceptions Regarding Bully Prevention Activities

Megan E. DiPaola-Allen
B.A., Emporia State University, 2006
M.S., Emporia State University, 2009

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty
of the School of Education of Baker University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

April 23, 2013

Dissertation Committee

_____

Major Advisor

_____

_____

_____

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine elementary principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying had been taking place in their schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. A second purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a relationship between elementary principals' perceptions about barriers regarding bullying prevention activities and their implementation of these activities. Additionally, the purpose was to examine perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. Elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities were also examined.

This study involved a quantitative research design using survey methods. The survey was adapted, with permission, from Dake et al.'s (2004) Perceptions of Bullying Prevention Activities survey. The survey was sent electronically via Survey Monkey to 710 public elementary school principals in the state of Kansas. The return rate of responses was 221, which totals 32.1%. Chi-square tests of equal percentages, chi-square tests of independence, and Pearson correlations were used for hypothesis testing.

Findings indicated that the majority of participants did not perceive any types of bullying (physical, verbal, psychological/mental, social, cyber, or indirect) to be a problem in their schools. Additionally, participants did not perceive that bullying was a problem in Kansas elementary schools. Of the fifteen bully prevention activities identified on the survey, participants perceived that eleven of these activities would lessen the amount of bullying occurring in Kansas' elementary schools. When examining

perceived barriers to administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, or having a conference day, participants perceived that none of the barriers mentioned would deter them from implementing any of the bully prevention activities.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my fiancé Justin as well as my mom, dad, step-dad, and brother. Achieving this goal would not have been possible without their continuous love and support.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the never-ending support my family, classmates, and colleagues have provided throughout this entire process. There have been many hours over the past two years that I have spent working on completing this dissertation. Throughout the entire process, they have stood by my side, showering me with words of encouragement along the way.

I would like especially to thank my fiancé, Justin, who has never known what it is like to spend time with me when I was not working tirelessly on my dissertation. His kind words, encouragement, and love have made it possible for me to work every weekend, every break from work, and all summer long to achieve the tremendous goal of completing my dissertation.

I would also like to thank my mom. Growing up, my mom always showed me through her actions what could happen if you worked hard and believed in the goals you set for yourself. She led through example how to be a phenomenal, loving teacher that went to all lengths to help her students learn. Through this example, she has helped me to believe in myself. Whenever I needed to be reminded of the reasons I began this journey in the first place, I looked to my mom for support and encouragement.

Thank you to my colleagues both at Bentwood Elementary as well as in the Kansas City Kansas School District. Their words of advice and willingness to help were greatly appreciated. Thanks also to the members of Cohort 7. Wednesday nights would not have been as much fun without each and every one of you.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers. Without her advice and commitment to helping me complete my dissertation, I would still be

writing. She not only gave up several hours of her time to review my dissertation, but she did it in a very timely manner. She was always there for me when I needed her and she pushed me harder than I have ever been pushed in my entire life. I feel very honored and lucky to have had her as my advisor. I would also like to thank the remaining members of my committee, Mrs. Katie Hole, Dr. Verneda Edwards, and Dr. Gary George for providing input. Additionally, I would like to say one final thank you to Ms. Peg Waterman. Thank you Peg for not only working with me, but also passing me on to Katie who literally sat by my side while I wrote chapter four. This dissertation would not have been possible with the support of all of you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

Sweeping the education world today is an endemic problem that is becoming harder to overcome. Educators, as well as parents and therapists, see bullying take place and hear victims' and bystanders' stories of bullying on a regular basis. Bullying has had a great impact on students' academic achievement, social interactions, and overall well-being (Kevorkian & D'Antona, 2008). Over the past twenty years, bullying has become more common when students are grouped together during recess, lunch periods, break time or even in classroom settings. Anytime students are together, especially when they cannot choose the members of the group, and no adult is present (or an adult with indifferent or accepting attitudes to bullying is present), they may exhibit tendencies toward bullying (Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999). Olweus (1993) stated that one child in seven is either a bully or a victim of bullying. The Youth Voice Project surveyed more than 13,000 students in grades five through twelve during the 2009-2010 academic year, and found that slightly fewer than 3,000 of these students had been physically hit, threatened, hurt emotionally, or stopped from having friends at least twice or more in the month previous to taking the survey (Davis & Nixon, 2011).

Bullying, as defined by Olweus (1993), occurs when a student is exposed, repeatedly over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students. Bullying behavior can take many forms such as direct physical aggression, direct verbal aggression, and indirect aggression (Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield, & Karstadt, 2000). Belsey (2004) defined cyberbullying as the use of information and technology (e-mails, cell phone text messages, instant messaging, defamatory personal Web sites, and

defamatory online personal polling Web sites) to support deliberate, repeated, and hostile behavior by an individual or group with the intent to harm others. Bullying behavior usually takes place in a secretive way so that the victims feel unsafe and insecure, and students who engage in bullying behavior compromise the fundamental ability of schools to educate children (Crone & Horner, 2003). To address this problem, school districts, as well as individual schools, must change the attitudes of students (i.e., bullies, bully victims, and bystanders) which could in turn help to change school climate and student behavior.

Background

The increase in the number of violent acts that took place in schools in the 1990s produced a dramatic shift in the public's perception of the seriousness of violence, and in 1994 violent acts that were not disciplined in the school setting were identified as the "biggest problem" facing the nation's public schools (Olweus et al., 1999). Now, all over the media, the public hears and sees news related to bullying with the majority of incidents including some form of social media or technology such as texting, Facebook, or Twitter. Bullying in schools has gained increased attention in the United States due to the focused media attention on homicide or suicide cases where bullying was a precipitating factor (Dake, Price, Telljohann, & Funk, 2004). During the 2009-2010 school year, 23% of public schools reported that bullying occurred among students on a daily or weekly basis, and 9% reported student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse on a daily or weekly basis (Robers, Zhang, & Truman, 2012).

In the state of Kansas, violent acts have been occurring in elementary schools, although violent acts are only recorded as injury and no injury, and then further divided

into in-school suspensions, out of school suspensions, expulsions, and other. As of 2011, bullying had not been added as a category or sub-category included in the data for discipline, including the data for violent acts reported to the state of Kansas. Several steps have been taken towards making school districts more aware of the seriousness of bullying in Kansas schools. In 2008, Kansas legislature amended the anti-bullying statute requiring school districts to adopt and implement a plan to address cyberbullying; adopt policies prohibiting bullying on school property, in school vehicles or at school sponsored events; and adopt and implement a plan to address bullying, which must include provisions for training and education for staff and students. Kansas Statute K.S.A 2007 Supp. 72-8256 defines bullying as the following:

> "Bullying" means any intentional gesture or any intentional written, verbal, *electronic* or physical act or threat that is sufficiently severe, persistent or pervasive that it creates an intimidating, threatening or abusive educational environment for a student or staff member that a reasonable person, under the circumstances, knows or should know will have the effect of harming a student or staff member, whether physically or mentally; damaging a student's or staff member's property; placing a student or staff member in reasonable fear of harm to the student or staff member; or placing a student or staff member in reasonable fear of damage to the student's or staff member's property. (a1A:i:iv)

In 2012, Senate Bill 278 was brought before the senate to amend K.S.A. 72-8256. It called for additional reporting and responding by school boards, superintendents, and principals of bullying if the incident impacted instruction in the school environment, occurring during or after school hours. The Senate Education Committee instead passed

an amended version of Senate Bill 69, which provides a little more force and direction to the current school bullying law, but deferred taking action on Senate Bill 278, which would have provided stringent timelines and added new definitions and provisions to laws regarding school bullying (Kansas State Department of Education, 2012). Because of ideas proposed in Senate Bill 278, Senate Bill 69 requires each school district's board of education to adopt a plan to address bullying through a process that includes representation of parents, school employees, school administrators, and the community through the school site councils. Each school district is required to publish this plan on the school district's website and distribute the plan annually to parents and guardians of students enrolled in the school district (Kansas State Department of Education, 2012). This bill recently was passed to assist in alleviating bullying by allowing representation of all stakeholders when adopting a plan to address bullying.

One study to date has investigated principals' perceptions regarding bullying and found that barriers, consisting of a lack of priority relative to other items, lack of training, and lack of resources, have hindered principals from implementing effective bully prevention activities (Dake et al., 2004). To alleviate this increasing problem, bully prevention curriculums are being implemented across the United States. In the state of Kansas, bully prevention programs are utilized in each public school district across the state. There are 286 school districts and 770 elementary schools in the state of Kansas.

Statement of the Problem

Adolescent suicides, lawsuits, and school shootings are reported in the media today as the nation hears and sees the reality of school bullying unfolding right before their eyes. Not only is bullying at school a problem but cyberbullying is also becoming a

problem. This occurs both on and off school property through the use of cellphones and the Internet. Tragedies tied to cyberbullying have made national headlines. Two recent cases have resulted in teen suicides: the story of a fifteen-year-old Massachusetts student who committed suicide in 2010 after extensive cyberbullying, and the suicide of a thirteen-year-old Missouri student in 2006 after she was targeted through the social-networking site MySpace (Davis, 2011). School bullying laws have been passed recently that call on schools to develop and teach a curriculum aimed at preventing the type of harassment that the Massachusetts student was said to have endured, whether it takes place in a school hallway, on a cellphone, or through the Internet (Viadero, 2010).

Bullying lawsuits are on the rise nationwide due to increased awareness, new standards, and more experts in the legal community (DiBlasio, 2011). In 2011, a twenty million dollar federal lawsuit against the Joshua Independent School District located in Texas was filed by the parents of a thirteen-year-old whose suicide allegedly was caused by daily bullying by peers and lack of action taken by school officials. This lawsuit was one of a growing number of civil court actions taken against school districts for allegedly ignoring bullying (DiBlasio, 2011). Also in 2011, two mothers filed a lawsuit against the Wayne County school system in Tennessee for failing to protect their children from being sexually harassed in a middle school locker room, and won $100,000 each at the conclusion of the federal trial (Gee, 2011).

More recently in 2012, the lawsuits continued to accumulate against school districts, teachers, administrators, and coaches surrounding bullying taking place at schools. In June 2012, a mother filed a three million dollar lawsuit against the Dickson School District in Tennessee for not protecting her child from allegedly being bullied into

performing sexual acts with a teammate on his wrestling and football teams (Sanders, 2012). A 2012 lawsuit at an elementary school in Clayton County, Georgia involved a boy who was said to be the victim of persistent bullying by a fellow classmate who repeatedly threatened him with physical assault (Winne, 2012). Because of these and other lawsuits occurring all over the United States involving bullying, elementary schools have to look at the amount of bullying taking place in their schools and bully prevention activities that will impact and prevent bullying from taking place.

Deadly school shootings that have a possible connection to bullying have been taking place over the past several years. In 1997, a fourteen-year-old boy fired several shots during a before-school prayer session killing three students at Heath High School in West Paducah, Kentucky ("Two Dead, Six Wounded," 1997). In 1998, two boys, ages thirteen and eleven, took several guns to a school near Jonesboro, Arkansas. The two boys pulled the fire alarm and began shooting as everyone exited the school, killing four students and one teacher and injuring nine others (Geiger & Collier, 2012). One of the boys had a history of threatening past girlfriends saying he would kill them if they broke up with him. One of the victims was a former girlfriend of that boy (Geiger & Collier, 2012).

People living in the United States are most familiar with two deadly school shootings, the shooting that occurred at Columbine High School in 1999 and the 2007 shooting at Virginia Tech University, but are not so familiar with the fact that there have also been deadly school shootings that have occurred among children as young as six years old. In 2000, a six year old boy carried a hidden handgun into his first grade classroom at Buell Elementary and killed one of his classmates ("Boy, Six, Accused,"

2000). The boy had been in trouble at school before this event for bullying-type behaviors (poking another child with a pencil, fighting, and for saying that he hated the other children at the school). When the shooting occurred, the boy had gotten in an argument with the classmate the day before, stole the handgun from his house, and killed the classmate with it the next day at school. Most recently in February 2012, a teenager described as a social outcast and a victim of bullying at Chardon High School opened fire in a cafeteria killing one student and wounding four others ("One Dead," 2012).

Because this has become reality, it is valuable to put energy behind bully prevention programs that are simple and easy to implement in an already time-constrained elementary school setting. In an effort to respond to the bullying epidemic, several bullying prevention programs have been established and implemented in elementary schools. Finding a program that has been shown to work in every school context, however, is not always easy, as studies of school-wide anti-bullying programs in the United States have yielded only mixed success in reducing bullying behaviors (Viadero, 2010).

In 1996, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado at Boulder initiated a project to identify ten violence prevention programs that met a very high scientific standard of program effectiveness (Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development, 2012). Standards were set for bully prevention programs that could be included in *Blueprints for Violence Prevention* (Olweus et al., 1999). These standards included a strong research design, evidence of significant deterrence effects, multiple site replications, and sustained efforts. When researching these ten bully prevention programs, researchers found that there were many challenges to implementing the

programs such as the structure of the school, amount of time and energy staff members can devote to interventions, lack of training, and involvement of parents, students, and non-teaching staff (Olweus et al., 1999).

In their study on the impact of a peer support service as an intervention to counteract bullying, Cowie and Olafsson (2000) determined that the intervention had no overall effect on levels of bullying or on the likelihood that peers would intervene to help. Likewise, Boulton and Flemington (1996) found that participants who watched a short intervention video did not report more bullying than those who did not watch it. Furthermore, they determined that watching the video led to students having negative attitudes toward bullying. According to Olweus et al. (1999), there is little political or program support for evaluation of bully prevention programs. Instead of funding evaluation efforts, it is argued that funds should be spent on the delivery of program services to help youth avoid involvement in violent or criminal behavior. To address this problem, school districts as well as individual schools have to identify and effectively implement bully prevention activities that are critical to successfully decreasing bully-type behavior as well as changing the attitudes of students, which will in turn change school climate and student behavior.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying had been taking place in their schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. A second purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a relationship between elementary

principals' perceptions about barriers regarding bullying prevention activities and their implementation of these activities. Additionally, the purpose was to examine perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. Elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities were also examined.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in the potential to bring awareness regarding the amount of bullying taking place in Kansas' elementary schools. This study also contributes to a body of research regarding leadership and bullying. It could also provide information about principals' perceptions and practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occur in their schools and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Based on the relationship between elementary principals' perceptions about barriers regarding bullying prevention activities and implementation of these activities, the results of the study could show which barriers cause bully prevention activities to occur less frequently, which is a starting point to finding solutions to overcome these barriers. Based on the relationship between perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities, information could be used to implement bully prevention activities that have the most impact on reducing bully-type behaviors. The relationship between elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities would provide insight into how training affects the impact of bullying in elementary schools.

The results of this study could also be used to improve professional development in regards to training about effective bully prevention strategies or provide insight into further design and implementation of bully prevention activities. Results will help education policymakers, school district personnel, community members, as well as teacher and principal preparation programs become aware of barriers that might prevent bully prevention activities from being implemented so that actions can be put into place to ensure those barriers are overcome.

Delimitations

"Delimitations are self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 134). The following delimiters were imposed on this study:

1. The survey was administered during the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year.
2. Only survey responses from the principals of public elementary schools in Kansas were included in this study.

Assumptions

"Assumptions are postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for purposes of the research" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 135). The following assumptions were made while this study was conducted:

1. The principals of the elementary schools accurately and honestly completed the survey.
2. The Kansas elementary school principals understood the survey questions.

3. The survey data collected was accurately downloaded from the survey software and uploaded to IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack 21 for Windows.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed to determine the type of bully prevention program taking place at a particular school and the principals' perceptions of the bully prevention program's effectiveness.

1. To what extent do Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with bullying in their schools?
2. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occur in their schools?
3. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the barriers to establishing bully prevention activities?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the school-wide implementation of these activities?
5. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the school-wide implementation of these activities?
6. To what extent does a relationship exist between the amount of Kansas elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their elementary

principals' perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools?

Definition of Terms

According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), key terms should be defined that are central to the study and used throughout the dissertation. The following definitions will be used in this study:

Bullying. Bullying is defined as any situation where a student is being exposed, repeatedly over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students (Olweus, 1993).

Bully Prevention Activities. Bully prevention activities consist of three specific strategies selected from the Norwegian Bullying Prevention Program, which were administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day (Olweus et al., 1999).

Bully Prevention Committee. A bully prevention committee is a group of staff members that coordinate anti-bullying efforts at a school (Dake et al., 2004).

Bully Prevention Conference Day. A bully prevention conference day is designed to raise awareness of bullying prevention by students, parents, and community members (Dake et al., 2004).

Bully Prevention Survey. A bully prevention survey is a survey administered to students to assess the extent of bullying in a school (Dake et al., 2004).

Elementary School. An elementary school, also known as a *Primary School*, is any "school offering a low grade of prekindergarten to 3 and a high grade of 8 or lower"

(U.S. Department of Education, 2008, para. 31). However, for this study a high grade of six was utilized for the sample schools selected.

Overview of the Methodology

This study involved a quantitative research design using survey methods to examine the extent of bullying principals felt was taking place in their schools, principals' perceptions and practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, and principals' perceptions of barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Elementary principals in the state of Kansas were the population of interest, with the sample including the elementary principals who responded to the survey during the 2012-2013 school year.

The 40-item survey was modified from a questionnaire used in a previous study examining principals' perceptions regarding bully prevention in the United States (Dake et al., 2004). The statistical analyses employed in this study differed based on the research questions. For research questions one, two, and three, chi-square tests of equal percentages were employed. Research questions four and five were analyzed using multiple chi-square tests of independence. Research question six was analyzed using Pearson correlation analyses.

Organization of the Study

This research study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one included the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose statement, significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and overview of the methodology of the study. Chapter two presents a review of the literature, which includes definitions and types of bullying, characteristics of a bully, risk factors for

bullies, victims, and bully-victims, bullying and violence, peer involvement in bullying, school's role in bully prevention, current interventions in bullying prevention curriculum, and the principal's role in bullying prevention and perceptions of bullying. Chapter three describes the methodology used in this study. It includes the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, hypothesis testing, and limitations. Chapter four presents the study's findings including descriptive statistics and results of the hypothesis testing for the six research questions. Chapter five provides a summary of the entire study including an overview of the problem, purpose statement, and research questions; review of the methodology; findings related to the literature; and major findings, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

The purpose of chapter two is to provide background information regarding the definition of bullying and different types of bullying that occur in schools. Specifically, risk factors for bullies, victims, and bully-victims are examined as well as the impact of bullying on victims. The role of bullying in the area of violence is touched upon in this chapter. This chapter also takes a closer look at bullying as it relates to the school setting. Peer involvement in bullying is explored as well as current interventions and curriculums to prevent bullying in the school setting. The school's role as well as the principal's role in bully prevention is examined as well as perceptions of bullying made by principals in the elementary school setting.

Definitions and Types of Bullying

A common definition of bullying among the research community is behavior that is aggressive in nature and is intended to "cause harm or distress" (Craig & Pepler, 1998; Limber & Small, 2003; Olweus, 1993). Bullying exists where there is an "imbalance of power and strength" between two people, and when the behavior is "repeated over time" (Craig & Pepler, 1998; Limber & Small, 2003; Olweus, 1993). For a bullying situation to occur, a victim must be less powerful than the bully and not of equal or similar power (Rigby, 2003). This imbalance of power means that victims have trouble defending themselves when exposed to negative actions by the bully.

In most bullying cases, bullies choose to use aggressive behavior even though the victim has not provoked or threatened the bully in any way. This is important to note, as the victim will feel more helpless in a situation when feeling attacked or threatened by a

person with more power. The effects of the incident will be different than when attacked or threatened by a person who has the same amount of power (Rigby, 2003).

Bullying behavior can be influenced by several factors and occurs between the bully and victim within a social context. According to Atlas and Pepler (1998), some of the factors that influence bullying are the individual characteristics of the bully and victim themselves, the interactions between the bully and the victim, the presence of bystanders (peers and teachers), and the context in which the bullying behavior takes place. Bullying can occur in many different forms and throughout a person's life although bullying during childhood and adolescence seems to be a much more common problem (Lipman, 2003).

The biggest difference between genders is the form of bullying that is used (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Boys are more likely to use direct forms of bullying (physical, verbal) while girls are more likely to use indirect forms of bullying (psychological/mental, social/relational) (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). There is also a difference when it comes to personality styles between those students who are bullied and students who become victims of bullying. Boys who bully have a more aggressive personality style and are physically stronger (Olweus, 1993) whereas girls who participate in bullying incidents use social manipulation that can include gossiping, telling lies, passing notes, or excluding the victim (Kenny, McEachern, & Aluede, 2005). The results of a study conducted by Juvonen, Graham, and Schuster (2003), results showed that boys were twice as likely as girls to be classified as bullies, three times as likely to be classified as bully-victims, and almost twice as likely to be classified as victims.

Bullying is recognized as a problem in many industrialized nations. Research on the prevalence and location of bullying has occurred in countries such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Spain, Italy, England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, Japan, Canada, and the United States (Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003). In the United States, 75% of children reported victimization from bullying and 14% of both boys and girls were estimated to suffer severe trauma from the abuse (Oliver, Hoover, & Hazler, 1994). The amount of bullying in the United States suggests that it is most likely related to social problems such as racial bias as well as lifestyle choices, and that bullying serves some purpose such as a way to solve disputes between groups of students who might later approach problems more intellectually than physically (Oliver et al., 1994). In 2007, cross-sectional data was collected from 7,418 students aged 9 to 14 years old and 453 teachers from 106 schools in Australia (Cross et al., 2011). This data was collected four years after a national policy was put in effect for the prevention and management of violence, bullying, and other aggressive behaviors. Based on student and teacher surveys, 26.4% of students claimed they had been bullied and 8.8% admitted to bullying other students, which was relatively the same percentages as data collected before implementation of the national policy.

Direct bullying. Direct bullying is any type of bullying that is aimed directly at another person through either words or actions. Direct bullying can be broken down into two categories, physical and verbal. Physical bullying involves intentional actions on the part of one person towards another person using physical forces such as hitting, punching, kicking, slapping, pushing, and choking (Olweus et al., 1999). Verbal bullying includes such actions as calling names, threatening another person, teasing, and spreading

rumors that are hurtful about another person (Olweus et al., 1999). Because physical and verbal bullying tends to take place synonymously, they are both categorized as direct bullying (Bohn, 2011).

When examining verbal bullying in more detail, male students report being bullied verbally when their academic grades were lower than that of peers. They also reported verbal bullying if they had engaged in fights with other students, if drugs were available at school, or if graffiti was present in the school (Bohn, 2011). Boys were also more likely on average to be more verbally aggressive than girls were (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

Indirect bullying. Indirect bullying is any type of bullying aimed at another person in a way that is not outwardly obvious. Types of indirect bullying include psychological/mental bullying and social/relational bullying. Psychological/mental bullying includes telling false stories about others, saying bad things behind people's backs, telling others not to be someone's friend, and trying to persuade others to dislike a certain person (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Social bullying usually occurs through spreading rumors about another person or manipulating groups of people to leave certain people out (Marsh et al., 2011). Social bullying, which could be classified as both indirect or cyberbullying, can also include behaviors that aim to destroy a person's relationship with someone else, which can be categorized as relational bullying (Rigby, 2003).

According to Crick and Grotpeter (1995), bullies who are relationally aggressive use relationships to harm their victims. This type of bully may threaten to exclude a friend from an activity if that friend chooses not to go along with the bully and what the bully wants to do. Relational bullying can also occur by a group of students who spread

rumors about a close friend or peer because that student did not go along with the crowd. Social/relational bullying appears to occur more with girls than with boys. Results from a study conducted by Crick and Grotpeter (1995) show that as a group, girls were significantly more relationally aggressive than boys, and girls were more likely than boys to be represented in the relationally aggressive group. In 1996, Grotpeter and Crick found that relationally aggressive children reported that they engaged in highly intimate and exclusive friendships. These children did not report high levels of self-disclosure to their friends but that their friends could self-disclose to them, which allow relationally aggressive children to gain private information from their friends that could be used in a bullying situation in the future.

Cyberbullying. Although both direct and indirect methods of bullying are the most well-known types of bullying, cyberbullying is beginning to take place around the nation, not just at school, but also beyond school property where students used to feel safe (Wiseman, 2011). Cyberbullying involves the use of any type of information and communication technology such as cell phones and computers to bully another person (Belsey, 2004). Although this type of bullying may originate on school grounds, it can be continued anywhere as long as the bully has access to electronic means. Because of the anonymity and distance of this type of bullying, the nature of the bully may not fit the definition of a "typical" bully (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Cyberbullying is proving to be more devastating than other forms of bullying because bullies using the Internet can reach a greater number of people simultaneously as well as remain somewhat anonymous to the people with whom they are in contact (Wiseman, 2011).

Since 2002, Hinduja and Patchin (2012) have conducted seven studies regarding cyberbullying that included 12,000 adolescents from over 80 schools across the United States using a variety of methodologies. Most recently, the methodology has consisted of surveying random samples of known populations of middle and high school students using a measure of cyberbullying that has evidence of reliability and validity. When surveying students, Hinduja and Patchin (2012) tell students that cyberbullying is when someone "repeatedly makes fun of another person online or repeatedly picks on another through email or text message or when someone posts something online about another person that they don't like" (p. 540). The results of the survey showed that 20% of the over 4,400 randomly selected 11-18 year-old students surveyed in 2010 indicated that they had been a victim of cyberbullying and about the same number indicated that they had taken part in cyberbullying at some point in their life (Hinduja & Patchin, 2012).

Although cyberbullying takes place both on and off school grounds, educators play an important part in encouraging safe online behavior and preventing cyberbullying. Cassidy, Brown, and Jackson (2012) completed a study involving two large, technology-rich secondary schools in Canada. During this study, 17 educators' experiences with cyberbullying, their knowledge of social networking technology, the priorities they place on cyberbullying, and the remedies they suggest were examined. Results of this study showed that educators involved in the study seemed to be concerned about young people in relation to cyberbullying, but that the concern was generalized across young people in general and not just situations that were taking place at their own school. Currently, there are 16 states that have bullying laws that include the term cyberbullying and five

additional states that have proposed to add information to their current laws about bullying to encompass cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2013).

Characteristics of a Bully

A student who is considered a bully can be characterized in several ways. According to Olweus (1995), bullies tend to show aggression not only to their peers but also towards their teachers and parents. A student who bullies other students is more likely to gravitate towards other aggressive students as well as be involved in gangs and other delinquent behavior (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Bullies also show dominance by wanting to be better than other people as well as the inability to control their impulsivity. They also show little to no empathy towards their victims (Olweus, 1995). Students who bully choose their victims based on certain criteria beginning with finding a student who is an easier target than are others around them. Bullies also thrive on situations where they know they will have more power and where victims are unlikely to stand up for themselves or retaliate (Marsh et al., 2011).

Bullies are more aggressive and physically stronger than are their peers (Olweus, 1993). They represent 7-15% of sampled school-age populations and are usually boys (Olweus, 1993). Students who bully others are just as much at risk for social and emotional problems as victims of bullying. Students who show bullying tendencies in elementary school exhibit more violent tendencies in later grades (Whitted & Dupper, 2005).

Juvonen et al. (2003) found in their study of 1,985 students from low-income communities that bullies manifested the fewest number of adjustment problems. Because bullies used their aggression in a negative way, they were usually not accepted by their

peers. Other aggressive peers saw bullies differently though. Instead of being rejected, they were seen as leaders or as popular because of their aggressive and intimidating tendencies (Pellegrini, Bartini, & Brooks, 1999). According to Oliver et al. (1994), boys and girls both agreed that bullies enjoyed higher social status than victims did although female responses were more in agreement than male responses.

Although bullies and victims are usually placed into separate categories with separate characteristics and risk factors, current research is challenging this assumption. According to Espelage and Swearer (2003), research supports the concept that bullying behaviors are dynamic and not static. Because of this, student involvement in bullying falls on a continuum between being a bully, a victim, a bully-victim, and/or a bystander. Using this continuum helps educators to see that students may show direct and indirect bullying tendencies in a more subtle way with less frequency, but these behaviors still have serious effects on their targets and should be examined.

Risk Factors for Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims

Children who bully other children or children who are victimized by bullies are both at risk for a wide range of psychosocial problems (Craig & Pepler, 2007). Bullying can have serious short- and long-term effects on all students involved including the bully, the victim, the bully-victims, and the bystanders (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). According to Dake, Price, and Telljohann (2003), research has found that children who are a part of any type of bullying are at a higher risk for several mental health problems including depression. In addition to depression, bullies and victims are at an increased risk for emotional, behavioral, and social problems.

Because bullying is a common problem among students, it is imperative to note that it is harmful to both bullies and victims (Oliver et al., 1994). According to Limber and Small (2003), research indicates that bullying is quite prevalent among American schoolchildren, directly involving approximately 30% of schoolchildren within a school semester. Of these 30% of children who were involved in bullying, 17% were victims of bullying and 19% were perpetrators. Physical aggression, verbal harassment, and name-calling are much more likely in schools today than serious injury or death (Orpinas et al., 2003). When thinking about the different types of bullying, it is not yet known which forms of bullying produce the most deterioration in the well-being and overall social, emotional, and physical health of victims (Rigby, 2003).

According to Craig and Pepler (2007), children who bully are at a higher risk for delinquency and substance abuse as well as using power and aggression gained from bullying in locations such as the school playground. Bullying may also be a precursor to an inability to form healthy, positive relationships as the person becomes an adult. This may cause issues such as workplace harassment, marital aggression, as well as spousal and child abuse (Craig & Pepler, 2007).

Victims of bullying can also have serious consequences and long-term emotional, academic, and behavioral problems (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Depression, low self-esteem, loneliness, and anxiety are also common issues that victims of aggression have to overcome (Leff, Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Power, 1999; Orpinas et al., 2003). Not only do victims suffer emotional problems from being bullied, other students begin to see the victim differently. These students may avoid the victim or refuse to associate with them. Victims of bullying begin to isolate themselves from society. For a student, that includes

leaving school or being truant more frequently than are their peers (Oliver et al., 1994). To understand fully why victims exhibit characteristics such as depression, lack of anger management, and a negative self-concept, it is crucial to look at how bullying and victimization are related positively or negatively and how certain characteristics encourage bully and victimization behaviors (Marsh et al., 2011).

Rigby (2003) analyzed several studies of short- and long-term consequences of school bullying that have been carried out in all parts of the world. The studies reviewed focused on the effects of bullying showing that victims had increased negative outcomes on their health, both mentally and physically. Four categories were identified from studies investigating the consequences of involvement in bully-victim problems, which show that health is negatively impacted when a student is being bullied (Rigby, 2003). The categories were defined as psychological well-being, poor social adjustment, psychological distress, and physical unwellness. Rigby (2003) concluded that when the health of children was related to bullying at school, it is unclear whether some of the suggested categories were a direct or indirect consequence of bullying.

Rigby and Slee (1993) conducted a study to examine the psychological well-being of Australian schoolchildren from two secondary schools. The study addressed whether tendencies for children to relate to each other at school in a bullying manner, as victims, or in a prosocial way, could be identified based on self-reports given by children. A second purpose was to examine if high levels of psychological well-being would be positively correlated with a relatively prosocial style of relating to others and negatively to being victimized by others. Results of the study indicated that tendencies to bully others, to be victimized by others, and to behave in a prosocial manner were all

independent from one another. This study also showed that low self-esteem was found to be more common among students who reported that they had been bullied and students who were victimized reported low levels of happiness. Prosocial behavior was linked to psychological well-being regardless of using self-esteem, happiness, or liking for school as criteria.

Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) conducted a study addressing the social adjustment of 200 Kindergarten students. The study examined whether peer victimization was a precursor of school maladjustment, if the effects were limited to the period of victimization, and if stable peer victimization experienced compounded adjustment difficulties. This investigation revealed that 20.5% of the sample reported moderate to high levels of victimization in both the fall and spring of Kindergarten, but less than 9% continued to be targeted for peer aggression over a period of time. Findings supported that victimization was a precursor of children's loneliness and school avoidance. Children had feelings of loneliness while being victimized as well as delayed effects of school avoidance even after victimization had ended. Results also showed that the duration that a child was victimized related to the amount of school adjustment problems.

The effects of psychological distress on sixth grade students were examined in a study conducted by Borg (1998). The study examined the role of gender and school level differences in emotional and behavioral reactions to bullying as well as focused on behavioral and emotional reactions associated with the bullying incident reported by both bullies and victims. Findings indicated that bullying victims experienced feelings of vengefulness, anger, and self-pity while bullies experienced sorrowfulness or

indifference. When looking at the differences in gender, boy victims had more feelings of vengefulness while girls felt more self-pity.

Physical unwellness was examined by Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield, and Karstadt (2001) in a study examining the association of direct and relational bullying experiences with common health problems. Children ages six to nine years old (n = 1,639) in 31 primary schools were examined in a cross-sectional study that assessed bullying using structured child interviews, and assessed common health problems through parent reports. Results of this study indicated that 4.3% were found to be direct bullies, 10.2% bully-victims, and 39.8% victims. The groups of students who were most likely to have physical health symptoms were direct bully-victims and direct victims. These students were also most likely to have high psychosomatic health problems such as poor appetite and feeling worried about going to school. Students who bullied other students but were never bullied themselves had the least physical and psychosomatic health problems. All of these results were based on physical bullying. There was no association found between relational bullying and health problems.

Juvonen et al. (2003) conducted a study using multiple data sources to understand better the psychological and social problems exhibited by bullies, victims, and bully-victims. A sample of 1,985 sixth grade students from 11 schools in predominately low-income urban communities of mostly Latino and black ethnicity was used. Peer reports of classifying bullies and victims, self-reports of psychological distress, and peer and teacher reports of a range of adjustment problems were used to gather data. Results from the study showed that 22% of the sample were classified as being involved in bullying. Of that 22%, 7% were involved as perpetrators, 9% victims, and 6% both perpetrators

and victims. From these groups of students who were classified as participating in bullying, bully-victims were the most troubled group, displaying the highest levels of conduct, and school and peer relationship problems. Of both bullies and victims, these bully-victims were the least engaged students at school, were left out, and made fun of by peers, and displayed behavior problems at school. This group of students was reported by Juvonen et al. (2003) to have increased amounts of depression and loneliness.

Bullying and Violence

Because of news media reporting physical violence and aggression in United States schools, Americans have seen a range of incidents from a child taking another child's lunch money in a coercive manner to bringing a gun to school and killing a classmate (Pellegrini et al., 1999). Reducing the amount of physical violence in schools is a concern of all stakeholders involved in education including principals, teachers, parents, and legislators (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). School-related physically violent incidents have encouraged district and school administrators, as well as teachers, to be more aware of students in their classrooms and schools and the need to be proactive in identifying potential violent situations (Mulvey & Cauffman, 2001). Many schools have adopted a "zero tolerance" policy in response to aggressive behavior and bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). In a pilot study conducted by Twemlow et al. (2001), an antiviolence intervention consisting of four components was put in place at an elementary school. The four components were zero tolerance for disturbances in the classroom caused by behavior linked to bullying and victimization including students who stood by during violent acts without responding, a discipline plan that modeled appropriate behavior, a plan to teach self-regulation skills through physical education, and a

mentoring program for adults and children. After implementing these four components, results showed that disciplinary referrals went from 74 the year the components were first introduced to 36 two years later. According to teachers at the school, the behavior of students who were victims of bullying and victimization also changed after implementing the four components. Students who seemed passive and withdrawn at the beginning of the intervention became more verbal and outspoken after the intervention.

Violence in the school setting can manifest in different ways. If not resolved, bullying, which seems to be the most prevalent form of low-level violence in schools today, can lead to more serious levels of violence (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Research has shown that one of the best ways to identify students who are having trouble with being bullied is through other students. By involving students in the process of identifying other students who may need help, a school must create a caring atmosphere that helps all students to feel safe and secure about sharing information (Mulvey & Cauffman, 2001). A caring environment is important because low-level forms of violence can have a negative effect on the learning environment of the school (Whitted & Dupper, 2005).

A study was conducted by Marachi, Astor, and Benbenishty (2007) to examine the relationship between the school policy, teacher responses to violence, and students' victimization outcomes as reported by teachers in a nationally representative sample in Israel. The study examined teachers' perceptions of a school-wide emphasis on violence prevention, staff/teacher action (or rather, inaction) in prevention efforts, and teachers' reports of student victimization. Results showed that when violence prevention became a priority of the entire school, staff and teachers at the school dealt with violent situations

more often. Findings indicated that having a school violence prevention policy did not automatically result in less student victimization. Instead, a response from teachers/staff about student victimization incidents had an indirect but positive impact on reducing victimization.

Peer Involvement in Bullying

According to Craig and Pepler (2007), when discussing bullying, students can fall into three distinct groups. The first group was students who are mostly uninvolved with bullying that is taking place. The only time this group of students is negatively impacted by bullying is when a group of students gathers to watch bullying take place. Students in the second group are those who are occasionally involved, and the third group of students are frequently involved in bullying.

Peer involvement in bullying may add to the amount or intensity of bullying even if they are not directly involved in the bullying behavior. In a study conducted by Atlas and Pepler (1998), the nature of bullying and victimization was examined within the classroom context using video cameras. Teachers collected survey and observational data on aggressive, nonaggressive, and comparison children to determine which children were eligible for the study. Participants in the study included 28 aggressive children ages 6-12 years old and 17 nonaggressive children who were nominated by teachers to match age, gender, and ethnicity of the aggressive students chosen for the study. One-hour observations were filmed in eight classrooms with an average number of 24 students in each classroom. Results showed that peers were usually present during bullying episodes but rarely intervened to stop the bullying or help the victim. The reason for this might be that peers did not have the strategies to confront bullying behaviors or knew what to do in

a bullying situation. Children may be unsure how to help or may be staying on task in the classroom and refrained from intervening or not following the teacher's directions. This study shows that peers are often aware of bullying and provide an audience for the bully, but do not intervene on behalf of the victim. To combat this scenario, interventions to reduce bullying problems should be aimed as a preventive measure for all students. Interventions also need to include lessons on providing strategies for students to use to stop bullying from occurring (Atlas & Pepler, 1998).

Schools' Role in Bully Prevention

The school environment influences many aspects of a school including impacting students' academic success indirectly, impacting students' behavior indirectly, and preventing delinquency, absenteeism, and violence (Johnson, Burke, & Guilen, 2011). Positive social interactions in the classroom, as well as feelings of belonging by students, help students link school with safety. When the amount of violence and disruptions in the classroom are limited, the amount of bullying that takes place will decrease (Johnson et al., 2011). The reasons that some children bully others as well as why some children accept being bullied and why bystanders do not report bullying needs to be carefully examined in the school setting (Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003).

A school as a whole has to work together to provide a united front when decreasing and preventing bullying behaviors (Kennedy, Russom, & Kevorkian, 2012). Teachers play an important role in preventing bullying as well as intervening when bullying behaviors occur. The way a teacher perceives the severity of a bullying incident will determine how much the teacher will decide to intervene (Kennedy et al., 2012). According to Juvonen et al. (2003), teachers receive little to no training in how to deal

with bullying behaviors even though they deal with the majority of the behaviors in the school setting. Because of this, it is essential to educate teachers about how to work with students to teach them proper interventions to prevent bullying behaviors as well as to assist teachers so they intervene effectively when bullying incidents do occur (Juvonen et al., 2003).

In a study conducted by Dake, Price, Telljohann, and Funk (2003), a national random sample of 359 teachers' perceptions and practices concerning school bullying prevention activities were examined. Based on the survey teachers completed, most teachers (86.3%) conducted serious talks with both bullies and victims when a bullying incident occurred, which was the only item on the survey that was a reaction to a bullying incident as opposed to a preventive measure against bullying. The other two activities that had the highest percentage of use were regularly setting aside time to discuss bullying and bullying prevention and involving students in creating classroom rules to address bullying. Both of these activities were used by less than one-third of teachers but were preventive measures to reducing bullying behaviors. Although teachers did not perceive any barriers to preventing certain bullying prevention activities to occur, they did not perceive that these activities were effective in preventing bullying behaviors as well as they felt more training was needed to implement these strategies in the classroom. The Dake et al. (2003) study provided evidence that there is a need for training to occur that includes all stakeholders to show the effectiveness of bully prevention techniques as well as the importance of using a "whole school" approach and gaining support from teachers, parents, and administers.

As schools implement bully prevention programs, all stakeholders will help in different ways. Students, as well as teachers, should spend more time discussing and explaining bullying behaviors as well as what is perceived as bullying. Students' perceptions of what constitutes bullying determines how often incidents are reported to administrators and teachers in a school setting (Dake et al., 2003). As students become more educated about bullying, the amount of reported incidents and behaviors should also rise. Students' perceptions toward bullies could have an effect on bullying within a school. The responses students have towards the bully will either ignite the bullying situation and add power to it or will have the opposite effect. As students talk about what is taking place in the school setting, parents' perceptions of the bully prevention program will determine their willingness to support or advocate for school-based prevention efforts (Dake et al., 2003).

Current Interventions and Bully Prevention Curriculums

Because bullying takes place primarily in the school setting, research studies (Craig & Pepler, 2007; Vidourek, 2004) have indicated that the most successful approach to bully prevention are programs that include a "whole school" approach, which incorporates multiple bully prevention activities at both the classroom and school levels (Dake et al., 2004). This approach creates a new school culture by changing tangible and intangible aspects of the current culture (Dake et al., 2003). Tangible aspects of a school culture would include school and classroom rules that target certain behaviors and intangible aspects would include changing the attitudes of students and teaching them about bullying and the harm that it causes (Dake et al., 2003). Current interventions must

focus on bully prevention activities that are effective and must be implemented across the entire school to make change happen.

In a study conducted by Sherer (2007), information from school psychologists' perceptions was obtained about American schools' current anti-bullying practices including strategies that were most and least frequently used to handle the problems of bullying in American schools. As reported by school psychologists in the study, the most frequently implemented anti-bullying strategies were school staff talking with bullies following bullying incidents, disciplinary consequences for bullies, adult supervision, school staff talking with victims following bullying incidents, and individual counseling with bullies. All of these strategies were reported to be implemented in over 90% of respondents' schools.

Sherer's (2007) findings suggest that some of the anti-bullying strategies that were reported in this study are consistent with best practice recommendations. Results of the study also indicated that over half of the schools where respondents worked implemented peer mediation and group counseling with bullies as part of their anti-bullying practices, which are not supported as best practices. Based on survey responses, current anti-bullying practices continue to focus on students who are directly involved in bullying (bully and victim) and not students who are indirectly involved in bullying (bystanders). About 20% of respondents indicated their school had an anti-bullying committee although this strategy is recommended as a crucial component in school-based anti-bullying programs.

School psychologists were also surveyed about their perceptions regarding the effectiveness of current anti-bullying strategies, the areas of bullying

prevention/intervention that needs to be improved, and the potential barriers to taking action. The most effective strategy to address bullying as identified by school psychologists was a school-wide positive behavior support plan (Sherer, 2007). However, school type and school size appeared to affect school psychologists' perceptions of effectiveness of the school-wide plan. The results of the study showed that psychologists working in schools with a smaller student population or elementary school settings perceived a school-wide positive support plan to be more effective than in other school settings.

The second most effective strategy was changing the layout of the space and making a more structured schedule for activities such as lunch and recess. Participating school psychologists generally held a positive view regarding the effectiveness of modifying space and schedule for less structured activities in bullying prevention, which may encourage schools to utilize this strategy. Other effective anti-bullying strategies, according to participating school psychologists, included immediate responses to bullying incidents such as talking to the bully and the victim after a bullying incident occurred.

School psychologists were also asked about most frequently identified barriers to improving current anti-bullying practices. Respondents reported that the major reason their schools did not improve their anti-bullying practices was because bullying problems were not considered a priority in their schools. Another barrier school psychologists identified was the lack of trained staff to plan or carry out the anti-bullying strategies.

Orobko (2009) conducted a qualitative study to examine how public schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia were addressing bullying and to examine policies and programs that public school administrators were implementing. Strategies and practices

that public school administrators were using as well as future directions educational administrators planned to take to address and reduce bullying were also examined. The study was conducted using structured interviews by telephone and e-mail with school personnel responsible for school safety and discipline. All twelve school divisions that participated in the study had policies either directly or indirectly in their student handbooks and programs in place to address bullying. Eleven of the twelve school divisions reported having strategies to address bullying and having plans to promote positive student behaviors and future directions for managing bullying. Many of the school divisions utilized a systems approach to address bullying by involving the whole school in research-based programs.

The school divisions trained faculty and staff on bullying, taught students and parents about bullying and positive character skills, intervened with bullies in place, and emphasized the quality of teaching, learning, and care for individual students that appealed to students. As a result of the study, it was determined there was a definite need for school systems to reexamine their current policies and practices to address specific classroom interventions, to address cyberbullying, and to support all bullying victims.

According to Dake et al. (2003), using the "whole school" approach requires all staff members and administrators to become familiar with the approach and be supportive of it. Because of the intensity and nature of bullying to spread across the entire school, students and parents also need to be involved. A "whole school" approach uses four characteristics (positive adult role models; established rules of behavior; non-hostile, non-physical methods of punishment; and supervising areas that are at high-risk for bullying) to decrease bullying behavior (Vidourek, 2004).

Whitted and Dupper (2005) stated that several decades of bully prevention research greatly expanded the understanding of best practices in school-based programs. Bully prevention programs that seek to change the culture and climate of the school are the most successful. Effective aspects of school-based programs include having strategies and interventions in place to help bullies, bystanders, families, and communities. Strategies for changing the culture and climate of the school, involving teachers and other adults in the school, and strategies designed to help victims, bullies, and bystanders are all included in a multilevel approach to bully prevention. These strategies must include school, classroom, and student interventions to be effective (Whitted & Dupper, 2005).

At the school level, interventions are designed to change the overall climate and culture of the school as a whole. One way to target bullying behavior at the school level is to create a written document, known as a whole-school policy, that addresses the school's beliefs about bullying and strategies that will be implemented, monitored, maintained, and reviewed to prevent and minimize bullying across the school setting (Smith, Ananiadou, & Cowie, 2003). When creating a whole-school policy, it is important to involve all stakeholders so that everyone has an opportunity to share their ideas and opinions.

At the classroom level, interventions are targeted towards teachers and staff members working in the classrooms with students, and at the student level, interventions are targeted towards individuals or groups of bullies and victims. Peer-support systems are one way of involving students by encouraging action on the part of students who do not like bullying (Smith et al., 2003). Peer-support systems take place during cooperative

group time in the classroom or during a community circle time where all students gather to do teambuilding and problem solving activities. During this time, the class can address relationship issues such as anger, fighting, and bullying. Another way of involving students in decreasing the amount of bullying taking place in a school is by creating a support group of peers that can work with and help a peer who is being victimized. This support group can act as peers that can "be with" or "befriend" a peer that is in need (Smith et al., 2003).

Together, whole school policies, classroom rules, and some type of bully prevention curriculum can have positive effects in reducing and preventing bullying behaviors (Smith et al., 2003). When the entire school works together to implement a bully prevention program, the program has an increased amount of coherence with all students (Smith et al., 2003). The next section highlights the Olweus Bully Prevention Program, which is currently being implemented in elementary school settings across the country and has all of the components of current best practices in bully prevention training as well as other programs including Child Abuse Prevention System, Don't Laugh at Me, KidPower, and Second Step.

Olweus Bully Prevention Program. One of the programs mentioned in *Blueprints for Violence Prevention* (Olweus et al., 1999) was the Olweus Bully Prevention Program (OBPP). This bullying prevention program is a multilevel, multicomponent program designed to reduce/prevent schools' bully/victim problems. The program attempts to restructure the existing school environment to reduce opportunities for bullying behavior with adults largely responsible for introducing and implementing the program (Jimerson, Swearer, & Espelage, 2010).

The first and most comprehensive evaluation of this program was conducted in Bergen, Norway, from 1983-1985, with 2,500 students from elementary and junior high schools. Results revealed substantial reductions (typically by 50% or more) in the frequency with which students reported being bullied and bullying others (Olweus et al., 1999). Researchers concluded that the reported changes in bully/victim problems and related behavior patterns were primarily a consequence of the bully intervention program and not of an irrelevant factor (Olweus et al., 1999, p. 51).

OBPP sought to increase awareness of bullying problems in students and adults in the school and to encourage adult involvement in resolving the problems. Methods used to accomplish these goals included assessing the problem, having conference days at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts, providing better supervision at recess, forming a bully prevention coordinating group, scheduling parent-teacher meetings, establishing classroom rules against bullying, convening classroom meetings about bullying, requiring talks with bullies and victims, and having discussions with parents of involved students (Dake, Price, & Tellijohann, 2003).

In a mixed methods study, Isaacs (2009) examined teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the OBPP in deterring bullying behaviors and whether those perceptions matched those of the students. Data derived from students' responses to the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was analyzed. Teachers from eighth grade bully prevention classrooms were interviewed as to how they viewed the program's success in lessening bullying behaviors throughout the school community. Results indicated that teachers believed the Olweus Bullying Prevention program hindered bullying behaviors within the

school building. Student responses supported this perception, although there were still reported incidents of bullying in the hallways during passing periods. Both teachers' perceptions and student responses indicated that the positive effects of the program were seen in the school setting but did not extend into the neighborhood surrounding the school. The teachers interviewed in this study all expressed the need for a bullying prevention program in all schools to reduce bullying and aggressive student behaviors and emphasized their enthusiasm about teaching the program and being directly involved in interventions to support the victim, bully, and bystander.

Lane (2007) conducted a study to determine the perceptions of parents, teachers, and staff on the effects of a bully prevention program at a suburban elementary school. Perceptions were focused on the areas of supervision of students, classroom/schoolwide behavior, and communication among parents, teachers, and support staff. Three assessment surveys (Teachers', Parents/Guardians', and Support Staffs' Perceptions of Bullying Prevention Activities Surveys) linked to the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program were used. The population of the study was composed of teachers, parents of students in grades 3-6, and support staff to determine their perceptions of the effects of the program. Out of 56 teachers, 48 responded for an 89% rate; 218 out of 371 parents responded for a 59% rate. Teachers, parents, and support staff agreed that the program resulted in positive outcomes, but there were some differences in perceptions as well. In the area of behavior, support staff agreed more strongly than teachers that the bullying program worked. In the area of supervision, all three groups noted the cafeteria and outdoor environments as concerns. Parents had a low level of agreement in several areas related to talks between school staff and bullies and victims. Results also showed that

there was a significant difference between the number of parents who knew about the program and parents who did not know about the program, so communication continued to be an area of focus for staff. Communication among administrators, teachers, parents, and bully/victims was perceived as an area of apprehension. Teachers or parents may not know about the communication exchanged between administrators and bullies/victims and/or parents so it was perceived as an area of not knowing how communication was resolved. Findings indicated that supervision in hallways, cafeteria, and the outdoor school environment were still areas of concern among teachers. In order for teachers to have more effective conversations with bullies, victims, and bystanders, professional development needed to be offered to them. This study supports previous research findings that an effective bullying prevention program should include assessing the problem, planning professional development, providing increased supervision, forming a committee among staff and community to coordinate bully prevention efforts, encouraging parent-teacher meetings, establishing school and classroom rules, incorporating antibullying curriculum within the classroom, and informing the community about antibullying efforts.

Child Abuse Prevention System program (CAPS). In a study conducted by Shulman (2003), the effectiveness of the CAPS Bully Prevention Program was measured to discover the critical factors in the program that affect students' attitudes toward aggression. Several central themes emerged from the findings in the study. Based on observations, evaluations of reactions and post-test surveys, students responded positively to direct instruction on bully prevention. Results showed a decrease in students' aggressive attitudes, particularly for boys. Direct instruction using a curriculum

approach provided bullies with a chance to reflect on their behavior and encouraged them to make appropriate social choices. It also provided victims and bystanders the opportunity to learn strategies for dealing with bullying behavior. Students' interview responses showed that visual materials and activities that the students could relate to were effective in affecting students' attitudes toward aggression.

A grade-wide approach to the bully prevention curriculum motivated students to engage in conversations about the lessons and reflect on what they had learned. By implementing the curriculum in this manner, teachers, administrators, parents, and paraprofessionals were all involved in the process and were knowledgeable about the lessons that were part of the curriculum. Since bullying incidents involve multiple students in the school setting, this grade-wide approach engaged students to think about empathy and their responsibility to respond and report bullying situations.

Don't Laugh at Me. The Don't Laugh at Me (DLAM) program helps students learn about the effects of behaviors such as ridicule, disrespect, ostracism, and bullying through music, video, and classroom activities (Operation Respect, 2005). Students learn through participating in this program that they can work together to change both their school and community environments positively. Four characteristics of a caring community are the program's focus. These characteristics are the healthy expression of feelings; caring, compassion, and cooperation; creative resolution of conflicts; and appreciation of differences. There are two separate curriculums for the school program, one for grades 2-5 and one for grades 6-8.

The purpose of Vidourek's (2004) study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the DLAM bullying prevention program in relationship to decreasing bullying behaviors and

increasing school connectedness. Results from the study indicated that DLAM was ineffective in decreasing bullying behavior and increasing school connectedness in a short-term evaluation. There were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups regarding school connectedness, bullying behaviors, importance of reducing bullying behaviors, positive and negative feelings toward class, perceived ability to reduce bullying behaviors, and perceived safety at school from pretest to posttest. Results of this study may be used to develop more effective bullying prevention programs. Further research in bully prevention and school connectedness was recommended to increase the potential effectiveness of bullying prevention programs.

KidPower. The KidPower approach is to teach students how to use safety skills when handling different social problems such as bullying through hands-on practice (Zande, 2012). This approach uses a step-by-step sequence to coach students in a positive way. There are eight skills that students learned and practiced to prevent bullying. The eight skills consist of walking with awareness, calmness, and confidence; leaving in a powerful, positive way; setting a boundary; using your voice; protecting your feelings from name-calling; speaking up for inclusion; being persistent in getting help; and using physical self-defense as a last resort (Zande, 2012). For educators, KidPower does offer a free extensive on-line library as well as affordable publications, workshops, and consulting services. A quasi-experimental study (Borbely & Zubriggen, 2011) was conducted on third grade students to determine the effectiveness of the program in building self-esteem and developing bullying and violence prevention skills. Findings showed that the two-hour school-based workshop and follow up sessions positively

contributed to in immediate increase in children's safety skills and that effect was retained three months after the workshop.

Second Step. According to The Committee for Children (2012) website (www.cfchildren.org/second-step.aspx), the Second Step curriculum has three main units that focus on social emotional learning skills. The three skills are empathy, emotion management, and social problem solving, which are all skills that are important for bully prevention. Under these three skills are other topics such as friendship building and assertiveness, which are also useful in bully prevention.

In a 2007 study conducted by Cooke et al., the Second Step program was implemented in eight elementary schools to examine the effects of the program on 741 third and fourth-grade students. Before implementation, training was provided to all staff and workshops were provided for parents. Ongoing support was also received by schools and teachers throughout the entire implementation process. Results from the study showed that significant improvements were made by students in the areas of positive approach/coping, caring/cooperative behavior, suppression of aggression, and consideration of others. Almost 75% of teachers reported that the program had a positive effect on students overall and 91.7% said that the Second Step curriculum would help their students in the future.

Principals' Role in Bully Prevention and Perceptions of Bullying

Principals are a vital part of a school's culture primarily through leading the school by working with teachers, support staff, and students to create a positive atmosphere conducive to learning. By involving principals in the implementation of a bully prevention curriculum within a school, the school, as a whole, can work together to

use the curriculum with fidelity. In order for principals to feel that bully prevention strategies need to be on the forefront of their own minds, it is important first to determine the barriers to implementing a bully prevention curriculum (Dake et al., 2004).

Kennedy et al. (2012) conducted a study of 139 teachers and administrators to explore the differences between their perceptions regarding bullying. Participants completed a survey regarding their perceptions of bullying in schools. Results showed that there were statistically significant differences between the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding their role in bully prevention. Administrators felt more comfortable communicating with the parents of victims while teachers felt more strongly that educators played an important role in bully prevention. Teachers also felt a greater need for bully prevention training compared to administrators. Findings from this study indicate that schools may benefit from additional professional development regarding bully prevention.

Dake et al. (2004) conducted a study to examine 378 elementary principals' perceptions across the United States regarding bully prevention using a survey to assess principals' stages of change and perceived barriers regarding selected bully prevention activities. Perceptions of the effectiveness of these same activities were also examined. Results from the study showed that none of the bullying prevention activities (administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day) were implemented by more than one in five schools even though principals perceived there to be no barriers to implementing these activities. Barriers that were identified by some principals included a lack of priority compared to other issues in the school, a lack of training, or a lack of resources.

Dake et al. (2004) found that principals' perceptions of the extent of bullying in their schools were less than the extent in schools across the United States. From survey responses, only 0.5% perceived the extent of bullying in their schools to be worse than bullying across the United States. There was no significant relationship found between the bullying perceived at the school and implementation of bully prevention activities. Possible reasons for this response may include increased coverage of bullying issues in the media or that principals were not well informed about bullying taking place in their schools. Principals may also not admit that bullying is an issue in their school if it is their responsibility to reduce the problem of bullying schoolwide.

When examining a relationship between principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities, Dake et al. (2004) found that principals perceived post-bullying activities (establishing negative consequences for students who bully others, having serious talks with the bully and victim when a situation occurs) as the most effective way to reduce bullying problems. Improved student supervision was the second most effective way as perceived by principals to reduce bully problems, and environmental bullying prevention activities (establishing a bully prevention committee, having a school conference day, establishing positive affirmations for students who help prevent bullying problems) was the third, and least effective, as reported by principals.

Principals who received violence prevention training were five times more likely to have a bully prevention committee than principals who had not received training, and principals who had received bully prevention training were six times more likely to have a bully prevention committee than principals who had not had the training. Dake et al.

(2004) found that principals who received bully prevention training were more likely to perceive environmental bully prevention activities as effective. The importance of a principal's job is being able to help their school realize that changes in their school environment can make a safer environment for learning. In addition, as schools take action to reduce bullying, a commitment has to be made to maintain those changes in years to come. Self-assessment as well as parent involvement can help a school stay at the maintenance stage of bully prevention and help students to see that bullying behaviors are unacceptable in the school setting.

Summary

Research reviewed in this chapter show that all types of bullying (direct, indirect, cyberbullying) are a challenge that schools face. Because of the different types of bullying that occur both on and off school grounds, there is a need for more research to determine the best approaches to combating these types of bullying. The risk factors for bullies, victims, and bully-victims as well as the impact of bullying on victims were addressed. The role of bullying in the area of violence was also discussed. A closer look at bullying as it relates to the school setting including peer involvement in bullying and current interventions and curriculums to prevent bullying in the school setting were examined. Chapter three provides an explanation of the methods used to answer the research questions formulated in chapter one.

Chapter Three

Methods

This study was developed to take an in-depth look at perceptions of elementary principals regarding bullying in their schools in the state of Kansas. Perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities were examined as well as the extent that bullying is a problem. Relationships between elementary principals' perceptions about barriers regarding bullying prevention activities and their implementation of these activities was examined as well as between principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and implementation of these activities. Training in bully prevention was also examined in relation to the principals' perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities. Chapter three describes the methodology used in this study. It includes the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and limitations.

Research Design

This study involved a quantitative research design using survey methods. The variable in RQ1 is the perceived problem with bullying, specifically the extent to which general bullying, as well as specific types of bullying, were a problem in the participant's school. The variable in RQ2 was the perceived amount of reduction in bullying. The variable for RQ3 was the perceived barriers to bully prevention activities. Variables for RQ4 were the effect of each bully prevention activity reducing bullying behavior and the implementation of the three bully prevention strategies. The variables for RQ5 were the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the level of implementation of these activities. Variables for RQ6 were the participant's level of

bully prevention training and the participant's perceptions of the barrier to implementing each bully prevention activity.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was all public school elementary principals. The sample included public school elementary principals in the state of Kansas. Only principals who responded to the survey were included in this study.

Sampling Procedures

Purposive sampling was used in this study. According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), "purposive sampling involves selecting a sample based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled" (p. 175). Principals were selected to be part of the study if their school was a public elementary school located in Kansas with a grade no higher than six. If an elementary school included a grade above six, it was not selected for this study. Selection of principals was based on the Public Elementary and Secondary Schools school directory for the state of Kansas.

Instrumentation

The Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention Survey is a 40-item survey that examines elementary principals' perceptions and practices regarding bully prevention in the state of Kansas. The Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention Activities Survey was adapted from Dake et al.'s (2004) Perceptions of Bullying Prevention Activities survey, which was developed to assess principals' stages of change and perceived barriers regarding selected bully prevention activities as well as the effectiveness of bully prevention activities used in previous research of principals' perceptions and practices of school bullying prevention activities (Dake et al., 2004).

An e-mail was sent to Dr. Joseph Dake on February 1, 2011 asking for permission to use the Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention survey. An email was returned to the researcher on February 4, 2011 granting permission to use the survey. A follow-up e-mail was sent to Dake on May 10, 2012 asking for permission to modify the Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention survey and permission was granted for that on May 10, 2012. (Please see Appendix A to find the series of emails.) The survey used in this study was modified slightly from its original version. Six items were added to the beginning of the survey about the extent that specific types of bullying were a problem within the school. In the demographic section, *Hispanic* was added to the list of response options for the race/ethnicity item. The order of the survey items was also changed from the original version.

The Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention survey started by addressing the extent that bullying in general is a problem in the state of Kansas and in a particular school. Items 1c through 1h addressed the extent that specific types of bullying (physical, verbal, psychological/mental, social, cyber, indirect) are a problem in their school.

Item 2 addressed school barriers: *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school?* The closed format multiple-select item had 13 response options such as *students would not answer honestly, administration of a survey about bullying would give the school a poor image,* and *we do not have the resources to address the problems identified in the survey*.

Item 3 addressed student survey administration: *Please check the description that BEST fits your school regarding administration of a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school.* This was a closed format multiple-select item with six response options such as *not thinking about administering a survey to the students* and *have been administering a survey to the students for two or more years*.

Item 4 addressed the establishment of a bully prevention committee: *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school?* This multiple-select item had 11 response items such as *teachers are not interested in such a committee, committee work does not result in effective solutions,* and *parents are not interested in being part of this effort*.

Item 5 also addressed a bully prevention committee: *Please check the description that BEST fits your school in regards to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school.* This item's response options were similar to those of item 3, with the exception that each statement asked about establishing a bully prevention committee instead of administering a survey. Participants were to check one response option that best fit their schools.

Item 6 addressed a school conference day: *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to have a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school?* This multiple-select item had 13 response options such as *we do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day, teachers or parents*

would not attend, and *there is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day*.

Item 7 also addressed a school conference day: *Please check the description that BEST fits your school with regard to having a conference day at the school for your students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school.* Response options for this item were similar to item 3 with the exception that each option addressed a school conference day. Participants were to choose one statement that best fit their school in regards to having a conference day.

Items 8a through 8o addressed other bully prevention strategies such as improving supervision in the hallways, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes, and contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation.

Item 9 addressed the number of school bullying problems reported in a monthly average over the previous two years. Item 10 addressed the level of violence in the neighborhood immediately surrounding the participant's school.

The final section of the survey included nine demographic items gathering information about the participants. These items addressed the participant's gender, race/ethnicity, age, highest level of education, years serving as a full-time principal, years serving as a full-time teacher, and the approximate racial distribution at the participant's elementary school. The two final items addressed the number of training sessions the participant had received in bully prevention, and the identification of a purchased bully prevention program, if any. Refer to Appendix B to find a copy of the survey utilized in the study.

Measurement. The variable in research question 1 is the perceived problem with bullying, specifically the extent to which general bullying, as well as specific types of bullying, were a problem in the participant's school as measured by items 1b through 1h on a Likert scale of 1 (*No Problem*) to 7 (*Major Problem*). The variable in research question 2 was the perceived amount of reduction in bullying, as measured by items 8a through 8o on a Likert scale of 1 (*No Reduction*) to 7 (*Major Reduction*). Specifically, these items address the effect each bully prevention activity would have on reducing bullying behavior.

The variable for research question 3 was the perceived barriers to bully prevention activities, measured by survey items 2, 4, and 6. These multiple select items addressed the participants' perceived barriers to implementing three bully prevention strategies: administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at their school.

The variables for research question 4 were the effect of each bully prevention activity reducing bullying behavior and the implementation of the three bully prevention strategies. The bully prevention activities variable was measured by items 8a, 8b, and 8c on a Likert scale of 1 (*No Reduction*) to 7 (*Major Reduction*), which addressed the effect of three bully prevention strategies (establishing a bully prevention committee, holding a conference day, and administering a survey to students) on reducing bullying behavior. The implementation of these strategies was measured by items 3, 5, and 7, in which participants marked one response option that best described the progress of the participant's school in implementing each bully prevention strategy.

The variables for research question 5 were the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the level of implementation of these activities. Multiple select items 2, 4, and 6 addressed the barriers to establishing bully prevention activities, in which participants choose from a list of options they perceived as barriers to establishing each of the strategies (administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee and having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at their school). Items 3, 5, and 7 measured the implementation of these activities, in which participants marked one response option that best described the progress of the participant's school in implementing each bully prevention strategy.

The variables for research question 6 were the participant's level of bully prevention training and the participant's perceptions of the barrier to implementing each bully prevention activity. Participants' level of training was measured by item 18 in the demographic section of the survey, in which the participant would provide the number of training sessions received in bully prevention. Perceptions of barriers were measured by items 8a through 8o on a Likert scale of 1 (*No Reduction*) to 7 (*Major Reduction*), which addressed participants' perceptions of the effect each bully prevention strategy would have on reducing bullying behavior.

Validity and reliability. "Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 181). Dake et al. (2004) established content validity on their survey by sending the survey to an expert panel (based on their publication record) for review. Minor revisions were made to the instrument based on the recommendations of the panel. Dake et al.'s (2004) survey was modified for the purposes of this study. Six items were added to the beginning of the

survey about the extent that specific types of bullying were a problem at the participant's school. In the demographic section, the term *Hispanic* was added to the list of response options for the race/ethnicity item. Some of the survey items were placed in a different order from the original version; however, changing the order did not change the content of the original items, so content validity was not affected.

Reliability is the degree to which an instrument is a consistent measure (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 181). Dake et al. (2004) established stability (test-retest) reliability using a convenience sample of 14 principals by retesting the survey one week after initial administration. High item agreement between the two test administrations was found at 88.8% for the barrier items and $r = .64$ for the perceptions of effectiveness items using Pearson product-moment correlations. Internal reliability of the survey was also established ($r = .71$) for the barrier items using the KR-20 method, and $\alpha = .91$ for the perception of effectiveness items using Cronbach's alpha.

Data Collection Procedures

Before collecting data, a Proposal for Research (see Appendix C) was submitted to the Baker Institutional Review Board (IRB) requesting approval for the study. Approval from the committee was granted on October 5, 2012. The letter of approval can be found in Appendix D. Data in this study was collected using the Principals' Perceptions of Bullying Prevention Activities survey. An email was sent to all elementary principals in Kansas on October 25, 2012 using the Public Elementary and Secondary Schools school directory for the state of Kansas asking them to participate in the study by responding to a survey using SurveyMonkey. The letter included the SurveyMonkey link that would take the principal directly to the online survey. A second

e-mail was sent via SurveyMonkey following the initial request for participation on November 5, 2012 to maximize response rates. Follow-up requests were sent to all participants asking for their participation again on November 13, 2012, November 29, 2012, and December 17, 2012. See Appendix F for copies of the emails sent to principals eliciting their participation.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

The following hypotheses were used to analyze data related to the research questions used in this study.

RQ1. To what extent do Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with bullying in their schools?

H1. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with bullying in their schools.

H2. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with physical bullying in their schools.

H3. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with verbal bullying in their schools.

H4. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with psychological/mental bullying in their schools.

H5. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with social bullying in their schools.

H6. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with cyberbullying in their schools.

H7. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with indirect bullying in their schools.

The first research question was addressed by calculating the frequencies of each response option in items 1b through 1h. The frequencies were used in seven chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated a problem with any of the types of bullying in Kansas elementary schools. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

RQ2. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools?

H8. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing a bully prevention committee to coordinate anti-bullying efforts reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H9. Kansas elementary principals perceive that holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities at the school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H10. Kansas elementary principals perceive that administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in a school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H11. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision of the outdoor school environment reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H12. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision in the hallways reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H13. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision during lunchtime or break time reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H14. Kansas elementary principals perceive that having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H15. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H16. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.) reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H17. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing negative consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.) reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H18. Kansas elementary principals perceive that when a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H19. Kansas elementary principals perceive that when a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H20. Kansas elementary principals perceive that contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H21. Kansas elementary principals perceive that contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

H22. Kansas elementary principals perceive that holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The second research question was addressed by calculating the frequencies of each response option in items 8a through 8o. The frequencies were used in fifteen chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated any of the bully prevention activities were perceived to reduce the amount of bullying taking place in Kansas elementary schools. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

RQ3. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities?

H23. Students not answering honestly is a barrier to the administration of a survey.

H24. Administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image is a barrier to administering a survey.

H25. Not having the resources to address the problems identified in the survey is a barrier to administering a survey.

H26. Lack of time for survey administration is a barrier to administering a survey.

H27. Not knowing how to develop such a survey is a barrier to administering a survey.

H28. Bullying not being a priority relative to other problems with which the school deals is a barrier to administering a survey.

H29. Bullying not being a problem in the school is a barrier to administering a survey.

H30. Opposition from parents is a barrier to administering a survey.

H31. Difficulty in gaining parental support is a barrier to administering a survey.

H32. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier to administering a survey.

H33. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier to administering a survey.

H34. There are no barriers to administering a survey.

H35. Teachers not being interested is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H36. Committee work not resulting in effective solutions is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H37. Parents not interested in being part of this effort is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H38. Lack of time for committee training is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H39. Lack of money to support such a committee is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H40. Lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H41. Establishing a bully prevention committee is not a priority relative to other problems we deal with is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H42. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H43. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

H44. There are no barriers to establishing a bully prevention committee.

H45. Not having bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H46. Teachers not attending the conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H47. Parents not attending is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H48: Lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H49. An anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other school issues is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H50. The school not having a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H51. A lack of money to hold a conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H52. Not enough time in the school year is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H53. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H54. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H55. Bullying not being a problem at the school is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

H56. There are no barriers to establishing a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

Research question three was addressed by calculating the frequencies of response options on items 2, 4, and 6. The frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated which barriers were perceived to be the hardest to overcome when establishing bully prevention activities. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

RQ4. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities?

H57. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact and the level of implementation of the student survey.

H58. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact and the level of implementation of establishing a bully prevention committee.

H59. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact and the level of implementation of establishing a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

Research question four was addressed using three chi-square tests of independence to determine the relationship between the impact and implementation of bully prevention activities. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

RQ5. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities?

H60. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a student survey.

H61. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a bully prevention committee.

H62. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a conference day.

Research question five was addressed using three chi-square tests of independence to determine the relationships between barriers to implementing bully prevention activities and where schools are in the implementation process. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

RQ6. To what extent does a relationship exist between the amount of Kansas elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools?

H63. There is a relationship between the amount of elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools.

Research question six was addressed using Pearson correlation analyses to determine the extent of the relationship between participants' level of training and the perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities. The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

Limitations

Limitations of a study "are factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 133). The study had the following limitations:

1. Participants who did not respond to the survey may have responded differently than participants who did respond, which could be a potential threat to external validity.
2. Bully prevention activities were self-reported rather than assessed through direct observation, so items may not have been answered truthfully.
3. The survey was primarily based on closed-format items that did not provide an opportunity for the principals to provide additional information.

Summary

This chapter restated the purpose of this research and provided a detailed explanation of how each survey item correlated to each research question. A purposive sample of all elementary principals in the state of Kansas was established and the survey used in the study was defined. Data collection procedures and methods of data analysis were discussed and methods of data analysis were examined. Limitations of the study were also stated in this chapter. Chapter four presents the study's findings including descriptive statistics and results of the hypotheses for the six research questions.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine principals' perceptions regarding bullying that had been taking place in their schools as well as perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools. An additional purpose was to determine if there was a relationship between the perceived impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities as well as perceived barriers to implementing bully prevention activities at their schools. The amount of training in bully prevention was also examined in relation to the level of implementation of bully prevention activities.

This chapter presents the study's findings including results of the quantitative analyses for six research questions. The following section, descriptive statistics, presents the demographic information of the participants, as well as the survey items' frequencies for the six research questions.

Descriptive Statistics

This study included a sample size of 221 Kansas elementary principals out of a total of 710 principals who received the survey for a 32.1% return rate. Because respondents were able to skip items on the survey, not all items resulted in a sample size of 221 principals. Out of those who responded to the demographic items (n = 185), 55.1% were female and 44.9% were male. Approximately 95.2% of respondents were Caucasian, 3.2% were African American, 1.1% were Hispanic, and .5% indicated "Other" when selecting their race/ethnicity. There were no Asian respondents reported. For this sample size, there was no principal who completed the survey who was less than

30 years old, 17.3% of respondents were between 30-39 years old, 34.6% were between 40-49 years old, 35.1% were between 50-59 years old, and 13% of respondents were over 60 years old.

Respondents varied in highest level of education with 80.5% holding a Master's degree, 16.2% holding a Specialist degree, and 3.2% holding a Doctorate degree. Participants in this study have been serving as a full-time principal for an average of 9.38 years and were employed as a full-time teacher for an average of 13.75 years before becoming a principal. The participants described the approximate racial distribution of their schools, on average, to be 77.33% Caucasian, 6.53% African American, 14.17% Hispanic, and 5.8% other. The average number of training sessions respondents had attended regarding bully prevention was 6.59 sessions.

Table 1 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' perceptions of the problem with bullying in their schools. A Likert-type scale was used for these items. Two hundred twenty principals responded to this item on the survey.

Table 1

Principals' Perceptions of a Problem with Bullying

Item	Frequencies						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	No Problem						*Major Problem*
1b. In your opinion, to what extent is bullying a problem in your school?	9	85	69	38	18	1	0
1c. In your opinion, to what extent is physical bullying a problem in your school?	47	112	47	12	3	0	0
1d. In your opinion, to what extent is verbal bullying a problem in your school?	4	59	70	54	30	3	1
1e. In your opinion, to what extent is psychological/mental bullying (e.g., stalking or intimidating) a problem in your school?	63	83	51	14	9	1	0
1f. In your opinion, to what extent is social bullying a problem in your school?	29	69	66	38	17	2	0
1g. In your opinion, to what extent is cyberbullying a problem in your school?	99	68	33	13	6	2	0
1h. In your opinion, to what extent is indirect bullying (e.g., spreading rumors) a problem in your school?	21	87	59	26	21	7	0

Table 2 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities. A Likert-type scale was used for these items. One hundred eighty-four participants responded to

item 8a, 183 responded to item 8b, 186 responded to item 8c, 187 responded to 8d, 186 responded to 8e and 8f, 184 responded to 8g and 8h, 182 responded to 8i, 184 responded to 8j and 8k, 183 responded to 8l and 8m, 184 responded to 8n, and 182 participants responded to 8o.

Table 2

Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Impact of Bully Prevention Activities

Item	Frequencies						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	No Reduction						*Major Reduction*
8a. Establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts	10	25	44	51	33	11	10
8b. Holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities at the school	19	47	39	37	31	5	5
8c. Administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school	18	25	38	46	40	13	6
8d. Improving supervision of the outdoor school environment	6	14	14	36	40	45	32
8e. Improving supervision in the hallways	7	20	22	30	38	43	26
8f. Improving supervision during lunch time or break time	8	22	19	27	41	42	27
8g. Having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school	9	38	36	46	31	15	9
8h. Establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying	11	18	20	36	37	34	28
8i. Establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)	4	9	17	32	46	46	28
8j. Establishing negative consequences for students who bully others (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)	5	16	33	37	35	33	25
8k. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior	4	15	23	38	43	31	30
8l. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes	3	17	30	36	41	32	24
8m. Contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation	2	9	24	31	43	44	30
8n. Contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation	3	15	27	39	42	27	31
8o. Holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions	16	25	32	25	40	32	12

Table 3 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to administering a survey. Participants were able to "check all that apply" to their school on this item. One hundred ninety-three participants responded to this item.

Table 3

Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Perceived Barriers to Administering a Survey

Item	Frequency
2a. Students not answering honestly.	43
2b. Administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image.	4
2c. Not having the resources to address the problems identified in the survey.	5
2d. There is a lack of time for survey administration.	21
2e. We would not know how to develop such a survey.	20
2f. Bullying is not a priority relative to other problems with which the school faces.	23
2g. Bullying is not a problem in the school.	13
2h. Parents would be opposed to such a survey.	3
2i. Gaining parental support would be too difficult.	5
2j. The Superintendent would be opposed to such a survey.	0
2k. The School Board would be opposed to such a survey.	2
2l. There would be no barriers.	122

Table 4 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to establishing a bully

prevention committee. Participants were able to "check all that apply" to their school on this item. One hundred eighty-five participants responded to this item.

Table 4

Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Perceived Barriers to Establishing a Bully Prevention Committee

Item	Frequency
4a. Teachers are not interested in such a committee.	17
4b. Committee work does not result in effective solutions.	9
4c. Parents are not interested in being part of this effort.	9
4d. There is a lack of time for committee training.	38
4e. There is a lack of money to support such a committee.	32
4f. There is a lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee.	16
4g. This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal.	30
4h. The Superintendent would be opposed to establishing such a committee.	1
4i. The School Board would be opposed to establishing such a committee.	1
4j. There would be no barriers.	113

Table 5 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to having a conference day. Participants were able to "check all that apply" to their school on this item. One hundred ninety-five participants responded to this item.

Table 5

Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Perceived Barriers to Having a Conference Day

Item	Frequency
6a. We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day.	15
6b. Teachers would not attend.	13
6c. Parents would not attend.	56
6d. There is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day.	41
6e. Having an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues.	53
6f. Our school does not have a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails.	8
6g. There is a lack of money to hold such a conference day.	50
6h. There is not enough time in the school year.	42
6i. The Superintendent would be opposed to such a conference day.	1
6j. The School Board would be opposed to such a conference day.	2
6k. Bullying is not a problem in our school.	13
6l. There would be no barriers.	73

Table 6 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' level of implementation of administering a survey as a bully prevention activity. Participants were able to check the description that best fit their school on this item. Two hundred ten participants responded to this item.

Table 6

Percentages of Principals' Implementing a Survey as a Bully Prevention Activity

Item 3. *Please check the description that BEST fits your school regarding administration of a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school.*	Frequency	%
We have not seriously thought about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.	62	29.52
We have started discussions about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.	27	12.86
We are currently taking steps to administer a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.	17	8.09
Last year was the first time we administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.	11	5.24
We have been administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school for two or more years.	74	35.24
We previously administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school but we no longer do.	19	9.05

Table 7 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' level of implementation of establishing a bully prevention committee as a bully prevention activity. Participants were able to check the description that best fit their school on this item. Two hundred four participants responded to this item.

Table 7

Principals' Establishing a Bully Prevention Committee as a Bully Prevention Activity

Item 5. *Please check the description that BEST fits your school in regards to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school.*	Frequency	%
We have not seriously thought about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.	79	38.74
We have started discussions about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.	20	9.80
We are currently taking steps to establish a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.	16	7.84
Last year was the first year we had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school.	11	5.39
We have had a "bully prevention committee" to coordinates anti-bullying efforts at our school for two or more years.	71	34.80
We previously had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school but we no longer have one.	7	3.43

Table 8 presents the frequencies of responses for the items that measured participants' level of implementation of holding a conference day as a bully prevention activity. Participants were able to check the description that best fit their school on this item. One hundred ninety-six participants responded to this item.

Table 8

Principals' Holding a Conference Day as a Bully Prevention Activity

Item 7. *Please check the description that BEST fits your school in regards to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school.*	Frequency	%
We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which we have a conference day.	40	20.5
We have not seriously thought about having an anti-bullying conference day at the school.	116	59.2
We have started discussions about having an anti-bullying conference day at our school.	4	2.0
We are currently taking steps to have an anti-bullying conference day at the school.	6	3.1
Last year was the first year we had an anti-bullying conference day at the school.	4	2.0
We have had anti-bullying conference days at the school for at least the last two school years.	22	11.2
We previously had anti-bullying conference days at the school but no longer have them.	4	2.0

This section, descriptive statistics, presented the demographic information of the participants, as well as the survey items' frequencies for the six research questions. The next section, hypotheses testing, contains results from chi-square tests of equal percentages, chi-square tests of independence, and Pearson correlation analysis.

Hypothesis Testing

This section contains results from chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was a perceived problem with different types of bullying, as well as the perceived amount of reduction in bullying, and the perceived barriers to bully prevention

activities. Chi-square tests of independence were used to determine the relationship between the impact and implementation of bully prevention activities and the relationships between barriers to implementing bully prevention activities and where schools are in the implementation process. Correlations were conducted to examine the relationships between participants' level of training and the perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities. All of the hypothesis testing was conducted at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance.

RQ1. To what extent do Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with bullying in their schools?

Frequencies of responses were calculated for items 1b-1h (see Table 1). The frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated a problem with bullying in Kansas elementary schools. These same frequencies were used for hypotheses 1-7.

H1. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 1, *In your opinion, to what extent is bullying a problem in your school?,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 216.24$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 1.

H2. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with physical bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 2, *In your opinion, to what extent is physical bullying a problem in your school?,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 321.10$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated physical bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 2.

H3. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with verbal bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 3, *In your opinion, to what extent is verbal bullying a problem in your school?,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 166.15$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated verbal bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 3.

H4. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with psychological/mental bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 4, *In your opinion, to what extent is psychological/mental (e.g., stalking or intimidating) a problem in your school?,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 214.11$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated psychological/mental bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 4.

H5. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with social bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 5, *In your opinion, to what extent is social bullying a problem in your school?*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 149.43$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated social bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 5.

H6. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with cyberbullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 6, *In your opinion, to what extent is cyberbullying a problem in your school*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 277.01$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority of participants indicated cyberbullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 6.

H7. Kansas elementary principals perceive there is a problem with indirect bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 7, *In your opinion, to what extent is indirect bullying a problem in your school?*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 179.90$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that the majority

of participants indicated indirect bullying in their schools was not a problem, which does not support hypothesis 7.

RQ2. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools?

Frequencies of responses were calculated for item 8a-8o (see Table 2). These frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated any of the bully prevention activities were perceived to reduce the amount of bullying taking place in Kansas elementary schools. These same frequencies were used for hypotheses 8-22.

H8. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing a bully prevention committee to coordinate anti-bullying efforts reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 8, *Establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 61.16$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated establishing a "bully prevention committee" would not reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which does not support hypothesis 8.

H9. Kansas elementary principals perceive that holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities at the school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 9, *Holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully*

prevention activities at the school, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 59.96$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated holding a conference day would not reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which does not support hypothesis 9.

H10. Kansas elementary principals perceive that administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in a school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 10, *Administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 48.99$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated administering a survey would not reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which does not support hypothesis 10.

H11. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision of the outdoor school environment reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 11, *Improving supervision of the outdoor school environment*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 48.86$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated improving supervision of the outdoor school environment would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 11.

H12. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision in the hallways reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 12, *Improving supervision in the hallways*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 32.77$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated improving supervision in the hallways would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 12.

H13. Kansas elementary principals perceive that improving supervision during lunchtime or break time reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 13, *Improving supervision during lunchtime or break time*, did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 33.09$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated improving supervision during lunchtime or break time would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 13.

H14. Kansas elementary principals perceive that having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 14, *Having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 49.51$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for

this item showed that more participants indicated having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school would not reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which does not support hypothesis 14.

H15. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 15, *Establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 25.62$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 15.

H16. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.) reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 16, *Establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.),* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 60.54$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 16.

H17. Kansas elementary principals perceive that establishing negative consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.) reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 17, *Establishing negative consequences for students who bully others (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.),* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 32.85$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated establishing negative consequences for students who bully others would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 17.

H18. Kansas elementary principals perceive that when a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 18, *When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 40.64$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior when a bullying situation arises would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 18.

H19. Kansas elementary principals perceive that when a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 19, *When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 37.92$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes when a bullying situation arises would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 19.

H20. Kansas elementary principals perceive that contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 20, *Contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 54.77$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 20.

H21. Kansas elementary principals perceive that contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 21, *Contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants'

responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 41.08$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that more participants indicated contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 21.

H22. Kansas elementary principals perceive that holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions reduces the amount of bullying in their schools.

The item used to test hypothesis 22, *Holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions,* did not have an equal distribution across the seven scale categories, resulting in a statistically significant difference among the participants' responses: $\chi^2_{(6)} = 24.81$, $p < .01$. The frequencies for this item showed that slightly more participants indicated holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions would reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, which supports hypothesis 22.

RQ3. What are Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities?

Frequencies of responses were calculated for items 2a-2l, *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school?* (see Table 3). These frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated which barriers were perceived to be the hardest to overcome when establishing bully prevention activities. The analyses were conducted for hypotheses 23-34 using the frequencies of how many times each item was selected versus not selected.

H23. Students not answering honestly is a barrier to the administration of a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 23, *Students not answering honestly*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 83.70$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that students not answering honestly was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 23.

H24. Administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 24, *Administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 207.23$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 24.

H25. Not having the resources to address the problems identified in the survey is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 25, *Not having the resources to address the problems identified in the survey*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 203.37$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that not having the resources to address the problems identified in the survey was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 25.

H26. Lack of time for survey administration is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 26, *There is a lack of time for survey administration*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 146.61$, $p < .01$. The frequency

for this item showed that lack of time for survey administration was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 26.

H27: Not knowing how to develop such a survey is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 27, *We would not know how to develop such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 149.89$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that not knowing how to develop such a survey was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 27.

H28. Bullying not being a priority relative to other problems with which the school deals is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 28, *Bullying is not a priority relative to other problems with which the school faces*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 140.17$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that bullying not being a priority relative to other problems with which the school faces was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 28.

H29. Bullying not being a problem in the school is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 29, *Bullying not being a problem in the school*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 173.83$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that bullying not being a problem in the school was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 29.

H30. Opposition from parents is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 30, *Parents would be opposed to such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 211.12$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from parents was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 30.

H31. Difficulty in gaining parental support is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 31, *Gaining parental support would be too difficult*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 203.37$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that difficulty in gaining parental support was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 31.

H32. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 32, *The Superintendent would be opposed to such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 223.01$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the Superintendent was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 32.

H33. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier to administering a survey.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 33, *The School Board would be opposed to such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 215.05$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the School Board was perceived not to be a barrier to administering a survey, which does not support hypothesis 33.

H34. There are no barriers to administering a survey.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 34, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 2.19$, $p > .05$. This does not support hypothesis

34: more than half of the participants perceived there to be no barriers to administering a survey, which was close to the expected outcome.

Frequencies of responses were calculated for items 4a-4j, *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school?* (see Table 4). These frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated which barriers were perceived to be the hardest to overcome when establishing bully prevention activities. The analyses were conducted for hypotheses 35-44 using the frequencies of how many times each item was selected versus not selected.

H35. Teachers not being interested is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 35, *Teachers are not interested in such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 159.93$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that teachers not being interested was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 35.

H36. Committee work not resulting in effective solutions is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 36, *Committee work does not result in effective solutions*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 188.31$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that committee work not resulting in effective solutions was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 36.

H37. Parents not interested in being part of this effort is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 37, *Parents are not interested in being part of this effort*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 188.31$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that parents not interested in being part of this effort was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 37.

H38. Lack of time for committee training is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 38, *There is a lack of time for committee training*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 96.48$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that lack of time for committee training was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 38.

H39. Lack of money to support such a committee is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 39, *There is a lack of money to support such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 112.96$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that lack of money to support such a committee was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 39.

H40. Lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 40, *There is a lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 163.35$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 40.

H41. Establishing a bully prevention committee is not a priority relative to other problems we deal with is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 41, *This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 118.76$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that establishing a bully prevention committee is not a priority relative to other problems was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 41.

H42. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 42, *The Superintendent would be opposed to establishing such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 219.01$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the Superintendent was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 42.

H43. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier for schools to establish a bully prevention committee.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 43, *The School Board would be opposed to establishing such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 219.01$, $p <$

.01. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the School Board was perceived not to be a barrier to establishing a bully prevention committee, which does not support hypothesis 43.

H44. There are no barriers to establishing a bully prevention committee.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 44, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.08$, $p > .05$. This does not support hypothesis 44: more than half of the participants perceived there to be no barriers to establishing a bully prevention committee, which was close to the expected outcome.

Frequencies of responses were calculated for items 6a-6l, *What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to have a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school?* (see Table 5). These frequencies were used in chi-square tests of equal percentages to determine if there was sufficient evidence that indicated which barriers were perceived to be the hardest to overcome when establishing bully prevention activities. The analyses were conducted for hypotheses 45-56 using the frequencies of how many times each item was selected versus not selected.

H45. Not having bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 45, *We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 166.81$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that not having bully

prevention efforts at the school for which to have a conference day was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 45.

H46. Teachers not attending the conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 46, *Teachers would not attend*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 173.83$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that teachers not attending was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 46.

H47. Parents not attending is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 47, *Parents would not attend*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 54.76$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that parents not attending was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 47.

H48. Lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 48, *There is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 88.69$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 48.

H49. An anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other school issues is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 49, *Having an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 60.89$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 49.

H50. The school not having a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 50, *Our school does not have a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 192.02$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that the school not having a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 50.

H51. A lack of money to hold a conference day is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 51, *There is a lack of money to hold such a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 67.35$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that the school having a lack of money to hold a conference day was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 51.

H52. Not enough time in the school year is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 52, *There is not enough time in the school year*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 86.18$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that not enough time in the school year was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 52.

H53. Opposition from the Superintendent is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 53, *The Superintendent would be opposed to such a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 219.01$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the Superintendent was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 53.

H54. Opposition from the School Board is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 54, *The School Board would be opposed to such a conference*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 215.05$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this item showed that opposition from the School Board was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 54.

H55. Bullying not being a problem at the school is a barrier to having a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 55, *Bullying is not a problem in our school*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 173.83$, $p < .01$. The frequency for this

item showed that bullying not being a problem at the school was perceived not to be a barrier to having a conference day, which does not support hypothesis 55.

H56. There are no barriers to establishing a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to test hypothesis 56, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(1)} = 26.14$, $p < .01$. This does not support hypothesis 56: more than half of the participants perceived there to be no barriers to having a conference day, which was close to the expected outcome.

RQ4. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities?

H57. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact of administering a student survey and the level of implementation of the student survey.

Frequencies of responses were calculated for item 8c, *Administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school* (see item 8c in Table 2) and item 3, *Please check the description that BEST fits your school regarding administration of a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school* (see Table 6). These frequencies were used in a chi-square test of independence to determine the relationship between the impact and implementation of bully prevention activities. Item 3 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We have not seriously thought about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*, and *We previously administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school but we no longer do*), implementation in process (*We*

have started discussions about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school, and *We are currently taking steps to administer a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first time we administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*, and *We have been administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school for two or more years*).

Table 9

Perceptions of the Impact and the Level of Implementation of the Student Survey (*n* = 186)

		Level of Agreement						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Level of Implementation	Outcome	*No Reduction*					*Major Reduction*	
No Implementation	Observed	11	14	15	14	8	6	1
	Expected	6.7	9.3	14.1	17.1	14.8	4.8	2.2
Implementation in Process	Observed	2	1	10	12	9	4	2
	Expected	3.9	5.4	8.2	9.9	8.6	2.8	1.3
Implementation Completed	Observed	5	10	13	20	23	3	3
	Expected	7.5	10.3	15.7	19.0	16.6	5.4	2.5

There was a statistically significant result for hypothesis 57: $\chi^2_{(12)} = 23.14$, $p < .05$. The frequencies for this item showed that there is a relationship between the impact and implementation of administering a survey, which supports hypothesis 57. More people from the no implementation category perceived administering a survey would not reduce bullying.

H58. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact of establishing bully prevention committee and the level of implementation of establishing a bully prevention committee.

Frequencies of responses were calculated for item 8a, *Establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts* (see item 8a in Table 2) and item 5, *Please check the description that BEST fits your school in regards to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school* (see Table 9). These frequencies were used in a chi-square test of independence to determine the relationship between the impact and implementation of bully prevention activities. Item 5 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We have not seriously thought about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school*, and *We previously had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school but we no longer do*), implementation in process (*We have started discussions about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school*, and *We are currently taking steps to establish a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first time we had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school*, and *We have had a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school for two or more years*).

Table 10

Perceptions of the Impact and the Level of Implementation of Establishing a Bully Prevention Committee (*n* = 183)

		Level of Agreement						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Level of Implementation	Outcome	*No Reduction*						*Major Reduction*
No Implementation	Observed	8	19	21	16	9	2	1
	Expected	4.2	10.4	18.4	20.5	13.8	4.6	4.2
Implementation in Process	Observed	0	1	7	13	7	2	0
	Expected	1.6	4.1	7.3	8.1	5.4	1.8	1.6
Implementation Completed	Observed	2	5	16	20	17	7	9
	Expected	4.2	10.4	18.4	20.5	13.8	4.6	4.2

There was a statistically significant result for hypothesis 58: $\chi^2_{(12)} = 41.23$, $p < .001$. There is a relationship between the impact and implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee," which supports hypothesis 58. More people than were expected by chance from the no implementation category perceived establishing bully prevention committee would not reduce bullying.

H59. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the impact of establishing conference day and the level of implementation of establishing a conference day to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts.

Frequencies of responses were calculated for item 8b, *Holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities in the school* (see item 8b in Table 2) and item 7, *Please*

check the description that BEST fits your school with regard to having a conference day at the school for your students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school (see Table 11). These frequencies were used in a chi-square test of independence to determine the relationship between the impact and implementation of bully prevention activities. Item 7 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We do have not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which we have a conference day, We have not seriously thought about having an anti-bullying conference day at the school*, and *We previously had anti-bullying conference days at the school but no longer have them*), implementation in process (*We have started discussions about having an anti-bullying conference day at our school*, and *We are currently taking steps to have an anti-bullying conference day at the school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first year we had an anti-bullying conference day at the school*, and *We have had anti-bullying conference days at the school for at least the last two school years*).

Table 11

Perceptions of the Impact and the Level of Implementation of Establishing a Conference Day (*n* = 182)

		Level of Agreement						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Level of Implementation	Outcome	*No Reduction*						*Major Reduction*
No Implementation	Observed	18	38	34	30	21	4	2
	Expected	15.3	37.8	31.3	29.7	24.9	4.0	4.0
Implementation in Process	Observed	0	0	3	4	3	0	0
	Expected	1.0	2.6	2.1	2.0	1.7	0.3	0.3
Implementation Completed	Observed	1	9	2	3	7	1	3
	Expected	2.7	6.7	5.5	5.3	4.4	0.7	0.7

There was a statistically significant result for hypothesis 58: $\chi^2_{(12)} = 25.28$, $p < .05$ which supports hypothesis 59. More people from the no implementation category perceived this item would not reduce bullying.

RQ5. To what extent does a relationship exist between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities?

H60. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a student survey.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to determine the relationships between each of the barriers to implementing a student survey and where schools indicated to be in the implementation process of administering a survey (see Table 12).

Item 3 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We have not seriously thought about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*, and *We previously administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school but we no longer do*), implementation in process (*We have started discussions about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*, and *We are currently taking steps to administer a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first time we administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school*, and *We have been administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school for two or more years*).

Table 12

Perceptions of Barriers to and Level of Implementation of a Student Survey (*n* = 210)

Item	Outcome	No Implementation	Implementation in Process	Implementation Completed
2a. Students would not answer honestly.	Selected	18	11	14
	Not Selected	63	33	71
2b. Administration of a survey about bullying gives the school a poor image.	Selected	3	0	1
	Not Selected	78	44	84
2c. We do not have the resources to address the problems identified in the survey.	Selected	1	3	1
	Not Selected	80	41	84
2d. There is a lack of time for survey administration.	Selected	10	3	8
	Not Selected	71	41	77
2e. We would not know how to develop such a survey.	Selected	13	4	3
	Not Selected	68	40	82
2f. This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal.	Selected	18	2	3
	Not Selected	63	42	82
2g. Bullying is not a problem in our school.	Selected	11	1	1
	Not Selected	70	43	84
2h. Parents would be opposed to such a survey.	Selected	3	0	0
	Not Selected	78	44	85
2i. Gaining parental consent would be too difficult.	Selected	4	1	0
	Not Selected	77	43	85
2j. The Superintendent would be opposed to such a survey.	Selected	0	0	0
	Not Selected	81	44	85
2k. The School Board would be opposed to such a survey.	Selected	0	2	0
	Not Selected	81	42	85
2l. There would be no barriers.	Selected	34	24	64
	Not Selected	47	20	21

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the first barrier, *Students would not answer honestly*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.85$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the second barrier, *Administration of a survey about bullying would give the school a poor image*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 3.07$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the third barrier, *We do not have the resources to address the problems identified in the survey*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 3.70$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the fourth barrier, *There is a lack of time for survey administration*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.05$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the fifth barrier, *We would not know how to develop such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 7.96$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of administering a student survey impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 60. Further, more participants in the

"no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the sixth barrier, *This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 17.08$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of administering a student survey impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 60. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the seventh barrier, *Bullying is not a problem in our school:* $\chi^2_{(2)} = 12.74$, $p < .01$. The level of implementation of administering a student survey impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 60. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the eighth barrier, *Parents would be opposed to such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 5.79$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the ninth barrier, *Gaining parental consent would be too difficult*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 5.85$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 60: the level of implementation of administering a student survey did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

The analysis for the item used to measure the tenth barrier, *The Superintendent would be opposed to such a survey,* could not be performed because no respondents selected this item.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the eleventh barrier, *The School Board would be opposed to such a survey*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 6.33$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of administering a student survey impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 60.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the twelfth barrier, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 19.72$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of administering a student survey impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 60. More participants in the "implementation completed" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

H61. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a bully prevention committee.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to determine the relationships between each of the barriers to implementing a "bully prevention committee" and where schools indicated to be in the implementation process of establishing a "bully prevention committee." The level of significance used for the test was $\alpha = .05$ (see Table 13). Item 5 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We have not seriously thought about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school,* and *We previously had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school but we no longer do*), implementation in process (*We have started discussions about establishing a "bully prevention*

committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school, and *We are currently taking steps to establish a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first time we had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school*, and *We have had a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school for two or more years*).

Table 13

Perceptions of Barriers to and Level of Implementation of a Bully Prevention Committee (*n* = 204)

Item	Outcome	No Implementation	Implementation in Process	Implementation Completed
4a. Teachers are not interested in such a committee.	Selected	16	1	0
	Not Selected	70	35	82
4b. Committee work does not result in effective solutions.	Selected	7	0	2
	Not Selected	79	36	80
4c. Parents are not interested in being part of this effort.	Selected	5	2	2
	Not Selected	81	34	80
4d. There is a lack of time for committee training.	Selected	24	10	4
	Not Selected	62	26	78
4e. There is a lack of money to support such a committee.	Selected	22	8	2
	Not Selected	64	28	80
4f. There is a lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee.	Selected	12	2	2
	Not Selected	74	34	80
4g. This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal.	Selected	26	3	1
	Not Selected	60	33	81
4h. The Superintendent would be opposed to establishing such a committee.	Selected	1	0	0
	Not Selected	85	36	82
4i. The School Board would be opposed to establishing such a committee.	Selected	1	0	0
	Not Selected	85	36	82
4j. There would be no barriers.	Selected	30	21	61
	Not Selected	56	15	21

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the first barrier, *Teachers are not interested in such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 25.26$, $p < .001$. The

level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the second barrier, *Committee work does not result in effective solutions*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 6.45$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the third barrier, *Parents are not interested in being a part of this effort*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.37$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 61: the level of implementation of establishing "bully prevention committee" did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item to measure the fourth barrier, *There is a lack of time for committee training*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 19.81$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item to measure the fifth barrier, *There is a lack of money to support such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 22.50$, $p < .001$. The level

of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item to measure the sixth barrier, *There is a lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 8.41$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was a statistically significant result for the item to measure the seventh barrier, *This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 33.51$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item to measure the eighth barrier, *The Superintendent would be opposed to establishing such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.73$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 61: the level of implementation of establishing "bully prevention committee" did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item to measure the ninth barrier, *The School Board would be opposed to establishing such a committee*: $\chi^2_{(2)} =$

1.73, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 61: the level of implementation of establishing "bully prevention committee" did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item to measure the tenth barrier, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 27.40$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of establishing a "bully prevention committee" impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "implementation completed" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

H62. There is a relationship between perceptions of barriers to and level of implementation of a conference day.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to determine the relationships between each of the barriers to implementing a conference day and where schools indicated to be in the implementation process of having a conference day. The level of significance used for the test was $\alpha = .05$ (see Table 14). Item 7 response options were collapsed into three categories: no implementation (*We do have not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which we have a conference day*, *We have not seriously thought about having an anti-bullying conference day at the school*, and *We previously had anti-bullying conference days at the school but no longer have them*), implementation in process (*We have started discussions about having an anti-bullying conference day at our school*, and *We are currently taking steps to have an anti-bullying conference day at the school*), and implementation completed (*Last year was the first year we had an anti-*

bullying conference day at the school, and *We have had anti-bullying conference days at the school for at least the last two school years*).

Table 14

Perceptions of Barriers to and Level of Implementation of a Conference Day (*n* = 192)

Item	Outcome	No Implementation	Implementation in Process	Implementation Completed
6a. We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day.	Selected	9	6	0
	Not Selected	53	114	10
6b. Teachers would not attend.	Selected	6	6	0
	Not Selected	56	114	10
6c. Parents would not attend.	Selected	16	38	1
	Not Selected	46	82	9
6d. There is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day.	Selected	13	27	0
	Not Selected	49	93	10
6e. Having an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues.	Selected	14	38	0
	Not Selected	48	82	10
6f. Our school does not have a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails.	Selected	3	5	0
	Not Selected	59	115	10
6g. There is a lack of money to hold such a conference day.	Selected	13	36	0
	Not Selected	49	84	10
6h. There is not enough time in the school year.	Selected	12	29	0
	Not Selected	50	91	10
6i. The Superintendent would be opposed to such a conference day.	Selected	0	1	0
	Not Selected	62	119	10
6j. The School Board would be opposed to such a conference day.	Selected	0	2	0
	Not Selected	62	118	10
6k. Bullying is not a problem in our school.	Selected	8	5	0
	Not Selected	54	115	10
6l. There would be no barriers.	Selected	26	35	10
	Not Selected	36	85	0

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the first barrier, *We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 6.27$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of holding a conference day impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "no implementation" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the second barrier, *Teachers would not attend*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 2.71$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the third barrier, *Parents would not attend*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 2.85$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the fourth barrier, *There is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 0.92$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the fifth barrier, *Having an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 8.21$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of holding a conference day impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61.

Further, more participants in the "implementation in progress" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the sixth barrier, *Our school does not have a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 0.92$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the seventh barrier, *There is a lack of money to hold such a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 7.82$, $p < .05$. The level of implementation of holding a conference day impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "implementation in progress" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the eighth barrier, *There is not enough time in the school year*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 5.50$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the ninth barrier, *The Superintendent would be opposed to such a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 0.94$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the tenth barrier, *The School Board would be opposed to such a conference day*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.89$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was not a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the eleventh barrier, *Bullying is not a problem in our school*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 5.85$, $p > .05$. This item does not support hypothesis 62: the level of implementation of holding a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier.

There was a statistically significant result for the item used to measure the twelfth barrier, *There would be no barriers*: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 23.79$, $p < .001$. The level of implementation of holding a conference day impacted the principals' perceptions of this item as a barrier, which supports hypothesis 61. Further, more participants in the "implementation in progress" category chose this as being a barrier more than the other two categories.

RQ6. To what extent does a relationship exist between the amount of Kansas elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools?

H63. There is a relationship between the amount of elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine the extent of the relationship between participants' level of training and the perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities (see Table 15). The level of significance used for the tests was $\alpha = .05$.

Table 15

Correlations Between Training and Perceptions

Item	*r*	*p*	*N*
8a. Establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts	-.060	.438	168
8b. Holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities at the school	-.091	.242	167
8c. Administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school	.001	.995	169
8d. Improving supervision of the outdoor school environment	-.018	.813	170
8e. Improving supervision in the hallways	-.091	.237	169
8f. Improving supervision during lunch time or break time	-.059	.446	169
8g. Having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school	-.072	.351	169
8h. Establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying	-.021	.784	168
8i. Establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)	-.016	.834	167
8j. Establishing negative consequences for students who bully others (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)	-.032	.683	169
8k. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior	.011	.884	169
8l. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes	-.093	.230	168
8m. Contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation	-.011	.888	168
8n. Contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation	.037	.631	169
8o. Holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions	-.178	.021	167

There was one statistically significant correlation between amount of training and item 8o, *Holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the*

situation and potential solutions, which was evidence for a weak, negative relationship: $r = -0.18$, $p < .05$. This indicates that the more training a principal had, the more the principal perceived that holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solution has no reduction in bullying. This also means that the less training a principal had, the more the principal perceived that holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions has a major reduction in bullying. These results do not support hypothesis 63.

Summary

This chapter presented the frequencies of responses for research questions one through four as well as results of chi-square tests of equal percentages for research questions one through three. Results for chi-square tests of independence were provided for research questions four and five. Correlation results were presented for research question six. Chapter five presents major findings of hypotheses testing, provides connections to literature, discusses implications for action, and makes recommendations for future study.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

The first four chapters introduced the background, purpose, and significance of the study; presented a review of the literature including the definition and types/characteristics of bullying as well as current interventions and the school's and principal's role in bully prevention; provided the methodology used in the study; and presented the study's findings including descriptive statistics and results of the hypothesis testing for the six research questions. Chapter five provides a summary of the entire study including an overview of the problem, purpose statement, and research questions; a review of the methodology; findings related to the literature; and major findings, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Study Summary

The study summary provides a brief description of the problem and purpose of the study. Additionally, the research questions, methodology, and findings are reviewed in this section.

Overview of the problem. Over the past few decades, bullying has becoming an increasing problem in schools around the world. Both direct and indirect forms of bullying have been used by bullies within the school setting (Wolke et al., 2000) as well as cyberbullying, a form of bullying that involves the use of technology, which has been used both on and off school grounds (Belsey, 2004). Bullying in school has gained more attention over the past few years because of media attention on homicide or suicide cases where bullying was a factor (Dake et al., 2004). Since bullying behavior takes place

during school hours, the majority of bullying situations happen in a private, secretive way so that victims of bullying situations feel unsafe and insecure in the school environment, which makes it more difficult to educate students (Crone & Horner, 2003).

To lessen bullying incidents in the school setting, school bullying laws have recently passed that require schools to develop and teach curriculums aimed at bully prevention (Viadero, 2010). Throughout the United States, several states are adopting laws around bullying. In the state of Kansas, several steps have been taken towards making school districts more aware of the seriousness of bullying in Kansas schools. In 2008 and 2012, Kansas amended its anti-bullying statute to address cyberbullying; to adopt and implement a plan to address bullying including training and education for staff and students; and most recently, to include a representation of parents, school employees, school administrators, and the community when writing a plan to address bullying (Kansas State Department of Education, 2012). Although states are working towards more strict statutes around bullying, there is still a definitive need to understand how bullying is perceived by elementary school principals as well as how bullying prevention activities are being implemented.

Purpose statement and research questions. As stated in chapter one, this study was designed to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying had been taking place in their schools. Practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities was also examined. A second purpose was to determine whether there was a relationship between elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these

activities as well as to determine whether a relationship existed between barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. The amount of training in bully prevention principals received was also studied in relationship to the perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools.

Review of the methodology. This study involved a quantitative research design using survey methods to address the research questions related to principals' perceptions. This study involved elementary principals in the state of Kansas who responded to the survey during the 2012-2013 school year. The 40-item survey used in this study was modified from a questionnaire developed by Dake et al. (2004) to examine principals' perceptions regarding bully prevention in the United States.

The variable in RQ1 was the perceived problem with bullying, specifically the extent to which general bullying, as well as specific types of bullying, were a problem in the participant's school. The variable in RQ2 was the perceived amount of reduction in bullying. The variable for RQ3 was the perceived barriers to bully prevention activities. Variables for RQ4 were the effect of each bully prevention activity reducing bullying behavior and the implementation of the three bully prevention strategies. The variables for RQ5 were the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the level of implementation of these activities. Variables for RQ6 were the participant's level of bully prevention training and the participant's perceptions of the barrier to implementing each bully prevention activity.

The statistical analyses employed in this study differed based on the research question. For research questions one, two, and three, chi-square tests of equal

percentages were employed. Research questions four and five were analyzed using multiple chi-square tests of independence. Research question six was analyzed using Pearson correlation analysis.

Major findings. Results of hypothesis tests indicated that although bullying was not perceived to be a problem within the schools, certain activities were perceived to significantly reduce bullying in schools. Overall, there were no barriers that were perceived to prevent the establishment of bully prevention activities. The impact and the level of implementation of bully prevention activities on the perceptions of the activities as barriers was mixed. One correlation between participants' level of training and the perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities was found to be statistically significant while the relationships between training and the other fourteen bully prevention activities were not found to be statistically significant.

The researcher investigated the extent to which Kansas elementary principals' perceived there was a problem with bullying in their schools. Findings indicated that the majority of participants did not perceive that any types of bullying (physical, verbal, psychological/mental, social, cyber, or indirect) to be a problem in their schools. Overall, participants did not perceive that bullying was a problem in Kansas' elementary schools.

The researcher also examined the perceptions of Kansas elementary principals regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools. Participants perceived improving supervision outdoors, in the hallways, during lunchtime or break times; establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying; establishing negative consequences for students who bully others; having serious talks with the bully when a bullying situation arises; having serious talks

with the victim about how to prevent further episodes when bullying situations occur; contacting the parents of the bully to make them aware of the situation; contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation; holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation; and establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying to reduce the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools to majorly reduce the amount of bullying in their elementary schools. Participants perceived establishing a "bully prevention committee," holding a conference day, administering a survey to students, and having parent-teacher meetings would not lessen the amount of bullying occurring in their elementary schools.

Also studied were Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Results indicated principals did not perceive any of the barriers to deter them from administering a survey to students to assess the extent of bullying in their schools. The same was indicated for the barriers mentioned for establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at their school, and having a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at their school.

The relationship between Kansas' elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities was examined. There were statistically significant relationships between the perceptions of the impact and the level of implementation of administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day. Results indicated the level of

implementation of the activities impacted the principals' perceptions of whether the activities would reduce the amount of bullying in their schools.

The relationship between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities was also examined. The level of implementation of administering a student survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and establishing a conference day did not impact the principals' perceptions of the items as barriers to performing any of these activities.

Lastly, the researcher examined the relationship between the amount of Kansas elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools. Of the fifteen bully prevention activities mentioned, only one activity (holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions) had a significant relationship with training; which indicated that the more training a principal had, the more the principal indicated that this activity would not reduce bullying.

Findings Related to the Literature

This section connects findings from this study to findings from previous studies related to principals' perceptions of bullying and bullying prevention activities. There are several similarities and differences between the studies presented in chapter two and the results of this study. Research question one of the current study focused on the extent that Kansas elementary principals perceived there was a problem with bullying in their schools. Dake et al. (2004) found that principals' perceptions of the extent of bullying in their own school were less than the extent in schools across the United States. From

survey responses, only 0.5% perceived the extent of bullying in their own school to be worse than bullying across the United States. In the current study, results showed that respondents felt that bullying was not a problem in Kansas elementary schools or in their own elementary school.

Research question two of the current study focused on Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying in their elementary schools. Principals in Dake et al.'s (2004) study perceived the activity of contacting the parents of the bully to make them aware of the situation as most effective while Kennedy et al. (2012) found that administrators are significantly more confident talking to parents of bullies and the victims of bullies. This study is consistent with both the Dake et al. (2004) and the Kennedy et al. (2012) studies, which showed that contacting the parents of the bully and contacting the parents of the victim to make them aware of the situation was perceived to reduce the amount of bullying in their schools. Orobko's (2009) study showed that one school system planned to educate the school community on bullying and to increase supervision in the school to decrease bullying behaviors. The current study showed that improving supervision of the outdoor school environment, in the hallways, during lunch time and during break time was perceived by Kansas elementary principals' to reduce bullying in their schools which is consistent with Orobko's (2009) study.

Research question three of the current study focused on Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. The results of this study are in agreement with Dake et al.'s (2004) study, which found that components of a "whole school approach" to bullying prevention (administering a

survey to students, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day) were rarely being done in elementary schools. In comparison, Orobko's (2009) study found that many of the school divisions utilized a systems approach to bullying that involved the whole school, including teachers, parents, and students, in research-based programs, which managed the amount of bullying occurring in the schools. Whitted and Dupper (2005) also found that bully prevention programs that seek to change the culture and the climate of the school are most effective. The findings of the current study are not consistent with the findings of Orobko's (2009) and Whitted and Dupper's (2005) studies, which did not find evidence to support that bully prevention strategies are effective at preventing bullying.

Barriers that were identified in Dake et al.'s (2004) study by some principals included a lack of priority compared to other issues in the school, a lack of training, and a lack of resources. Sherer's (2007) study of school psychologists, as well as the current study, showed a similar pattern in identified barriers to the Dake et al. (2004) study. Results from the Dake et al. (2004) study showed that none of the bullying prevention activities (administering a survey to students, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day) mentioned were being done by more than one in five schools even though principals perceived there to be no barriers to implementing these activities. The results of the current study concur with Dake et al.'s (2004) findings that principals perceived there to be no barriers to administering a survey to students, establishing a bully prevention committee, or having a conference day, as well as Dake et al.'s (2003) study that teachers did not perceive any barriers to these same bully prevention activities.

Research question four of the current study examined the relationship between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. Results of the current study were similar to Dake et al.'s (2004) study, which showed that schools were distributed across the various stages of change model from not seriously thinking about implementing a bully prevention activity (administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, having a conference day) to implementing a bully prevention activity for two or more years. Dake et al. (2004) put all bully prevention activities not related to a whole school approach into three categories: post-bullying activities, environmental bullying prevention activities, and improved student supervision. Dake et al. (2004) and Sherer (2007) found that post-bullying activities were most effective. Sherer's (2007) study also showed that American schools' current anti-bullying practices were taking both a proactive (improved student supervision) as well as reactive (post-bullying activities) approach, but schools may have a tendency to implement mostly reactive strategies. Based on the current study's findings, respondents in the "no implementation" category perceived the activities to not reduce bullying, more so than the principals in the other two categories.

Research question five of the current study examined the relationship between Kansas elementary principals' perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. Findings of the current study are contradictory of the Kennedy et al. (2012) study in the role that teachers should take regarding bully prevention, which suggested a need for increased dialogue and transparency between teachers and school administrators to ensure that both groups are

working together to solve the bullying problem within schools. Kennedy et al.'s (2012) study showed that teachers felt more strongly than administrators did that educators should have a greater role regarding bullying prevention. The current study found that principals' in the "no implementation" category of establishing a bully prevention committee perceived one of the barriers to implementing a bully prevention committee was that teachers would not be interested in such a committee. Principals' in the "no implementation" category also perceived lack of time for committee training, lack of money to support such a committee, lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee, and establishing a bully prevention committee not being a priority relative to other problems that occur in the school to be barriers to establishing a bully prevention committee. Kennedy et al.'s (2012) study also showed that males and females differed in their perceptions of the importance of bully prevention as part of a standardized school curriculum than males. The results of the current study found minimal evidence to support that bullying is a problem in the school setting, so prevention of bullying behaviors would not be an issue because there is not enough evidence to warrant full support of the hypotheses in this study.

Research question six of the current study examined the relationship between the amount of Kansas' elementary principals training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in their schools. Descriptive statistics showed that 87.3% of principals who participated in Dake et al.'s (2004) study had training in bully prevention, violence prevention, or both. In the current study, the average number of principals who attended training sessions in bully prevention was 78.54%. According to these results, the current study and Dake et al.'s

(2004) study showed that the majority of respondents had participated in some type of bully prevention training. Kennedy et al. (2012) found that schools might benefit from increased professional development for teachers and administrators on bullying prevention. Approximately 90% of educators and administrators agreed that bullying prevention should be a part of the curriculum in all schools and 93% agreed that they were interested in receiving training in Kennedy et al.'s (2012) study. Lane's (2007) study also revealed that staff development needed to be offered to staff in regards to effective conversations with bullies, victims, and bystanders. Based on results from the current study, this would not be an issue as most respondents had received training in bully prevention.

According to Dake et al. (2004), principals who received violence prevention training were five times more likely to have a bully prevention committee than principals who had not received training, and principals who had received bully prevention training were six times more likely to have a bully prevention committee than principals who had not had the training. Also, in Dake et al.'s (2004) study, those who had received bullying prevention training perceived environmental bullying prevention activities as more effective than those who had not received such training. With the exception of one activity in the current study, there were no statistically significant relationships between training and the perceptions of bully prevention activities, which did not coincide with results of Dake et al.'s (2004) study.

Conclusions

As stated in chapter one, principals' perceptions of bully prevention activities and their impact on students in their schools play an important role on the implementation of

these activities. Since this study is one of very few studies conducted on principals' perceptions of bullying, the findings have specific implications for future action. These implications for future action as well as suggestions for additional research and concluding remarks are presented in this section.

Implications for action. Bullying has had a great impact on students' academic achievement, social interactions, and overall well-being (Kevorkian & D'Antona, 2008). Since this study showed that principals do not perceive any type of bullying to be a problem in their school, it should be a first priority of principals to determine if all other stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, support staff, and community members) feel the same way about bullying in their school. From this information, principals may need to reexamine their own perceptions of bullying in their school. To decrease bullying behaviors that may be occurring in the elementary school setting, strong implications exist for Kansas elementary principals as well as elementary principals located across the United States as to the type of bully prevention activities that could be implemented easily in the school setting. Kansas elementary principals' can use this study to direct bullying prevention efforts toward activities that principals found would have no barriers when implementing, which include administering a survey, establishing a "bully prevention committee," and having a conference day.

Principals can also consider implementing bully prevention activities that other principals have perceived to reduce bullying in their schools, such as improving supervision of the outdoor school environment, in the hallways, at break time and at lunch time; establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying; establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying; establishing negative

consequences for students who bully others, having serious talks with the bully and with the victim when a bullying situation arises, contacting the parents of the bully and of the victim to make them aware of the situation, and holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions. Teachers, as well as parents, could also use results of the study to support their school in implementing these bully prevention activities.

This study also includes strong implications for parents. According to Dake et al. (2004), children have a right to come to school and learn in a safe environment free of bullying and parents will go to all means to make sure this right is given to their children. Because students have more access to electronic devices at home such as a laptop, iPad, or cell phone, parents may be seeing more bullying-type behaviors taking place at home than principals are noticing in the school setting. Because of this, parents might want the school to include such activities such as holding a conference day or establishing a bully prevention committee so they can be a part of bully prevention efforts within the school setting.

Since this study showed that there was not a statistically significant relationship between training in bully prevention and perceptions of impact of all the bully prevention activities on reducing bullying in schools, principals as well as school districts might consider looking into the types of training provided to principals regarding bully prevention as well as specific professional development related to the identification of bullying behaviors. According to Dake et al. (2004), principals are "key decision makers in the school, so appropriate training regarding effective bullying measures is essential"

(p. 384). The training principals receive could also be utilized in a way to support teachers, as well as students, in the school pertaining to bully prevention.

This study also showed that principals who were not implementing bully prevention activities (administering a survey, establishing a bully prevention committee, and having a conference day) also perceived that the bully prevention activities would not have an impact on reducing bullying behaviors. Because of this, it is important for principals to receive professional development in research-based bully prevention activities and the benefits of including these activities within the school setting.

Recommendations for future research. After examining the major findings of this study and understanding the implications for action, recommendations can be made regarding further research in the following areas.

1. Replicate the current study using data from other states to determine if the findings of the current study are similar in other states. Replication of the study in other states would further research by providing additional data about the perceptions of bullying held by elementary principals.
2. Conduct the current study in middle or high school settings to determine if the findings are similar. Conducting the study in middle or high school settings would further research by providing additional data about the perceptions of bullying held by middle and high school principals.
3. Modify this study utilizing principals' perceptions from private elementary schools in the state of Kansas in place of public schools. Modification of the study in private elementary settings instead of public elementary settings

would further research by providing additional data about the perceptions of bullying held by private school elementary principals.

4. Modify this study to include principals' perceptions from both public and private elementary schools. Modification of the study in private elementary settings instead of public elementary settings would further research by providing comparison data about the perceptions of bullying held by private elementary and public elementary school principals.
5. Modify this study to include only one school district comparing the perceptions of parents, teachers, and administrators. A study of this nature would allow district leadership to examine the perceptions of bullying held by parents, teacher, and administrators across all grade levels in the district.
6. Modify this study by increasing the sample size to elementary principals and teachers and comparing the responses of the two groups. Modification of the study by increasing the sample size would further research by providing comparison data about the perceptions of bullying held by public elementary school principals as well as public elementary school teachers.
7. Conduct qualitative research including interviews and observations to gain more detailed accounts of principals' perceptions regarding bullying. Conducting qualitative research would further research by providing additional data about principals' perceptions of bullying.
8. Conduct a study related to elementary principals' perceptions regarding the role of the principal in the prevention of bullying. Conducting a study regarding the role of the principal in the prevention of bullying would further

research by adding to the knowledge base regarding perceptions of bullying held by public elementary school.

9. Conduct a study regarding perceptions of parents who have elementary-aged students related to bully prevention efforts in the elementary school setting. Conducting a study of this nature would further research by providing additional data about the perceptions of bullying held by parents of elementary-aged students.

Concluding Remarks

This study was designed to determine principals' perceptions related to bullying and bullying prevention activities that took place in their schools. Based on the research that children who are a part of any type of bullying are at a higher risk for several mental health problems including depression as well as emotional, social, and behavioral problems (Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003), principals need to continue to monitor the amount of bullying that is taking place in their schools and make decisions based on decreasing these bullying behaviors. Although this study's findings do not fully agree with the findings of other studies, these findings can still be used to add to the knowledge base of principals' perceptions of bullying in elementary schools.

References

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

Belsey, B. (2004). *What can be done about cyberbullying?* Retrieved from http://www.cyberbullying.ca

Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development (2012). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from www.blueprintsprograms.com/FAQ.php#BP-begin

Bohn, C. (2011). *Predicting bullying among high school students using individual and school factors: Analysis of a national survey* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1490789)

Borbely, C., & Zubriggen, E. (2011). *The effects of the kidpower everyday safety program on third grade children in Santa Cruz county*. Retrieved from www.kidpower.org/pdfs/research-report-full.pdf

Borg, M. G. (1998). The emotional reactions of school bullies and their victims. *Educational Psychology, 18*(4), 433-444.

Boulton, M., & Flemington, I. (1996). The effects of a short video intervention on secondary school pupils' involvement in definitions of and attitudes toward bullying. *School Psychology International, 17*, 331-345.

Boy, six, accused in classmate's shooting. (2000, March 1). *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2000/03/01/us/boy-6-accused-in-classmate-s-killing.html

Cassidy, W., Brown, K., & Jackson, M. (2012). "Under the radar": Educators and cyberbullying in schools. *School Psychology International, 33*(5), 520-532. doi: 10.1177/0143034312445245

Committee for Children. (2012). *Second Step: Social skills for early childhood-grade 8.* Retrieved from www.cfchildren.org/second-step.aspx

Cooke, M., Ford, J., Levine, J., Bourke, C., Newell, L., & Lapidus, G. (2007). The effects of city-wide implementation of "Second Step" on elementary school students' prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 28*(2), 93-115.

Cowie, H., & Olafsson, R. (2000). The role of peer support in helping the victims of bullying in a school with high levels of aggression. *School Psychology International, 21*, 79-95.

Craig, W., & Pepler, D. (1998). Observations of bullying and victimization in the schoolyard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 41-59.

Craig, W., & Pepler, D. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology, 48*(2), 86-93.

Crick, N., & Grotpeter, J. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710-722.

Crone, D. A., & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools: Functional behavior assessment.* New York, NY: Guilford.

Cross, D., Epstein, M., Hearn, L., Slee, P., Shaw, T., & Monks, H. (2011). National safe schools framework: Policy and practice to reduce bullying in Australian schools. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*(5), 398-404.

Dake, J., Price, J., & Tellijohann, S. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *Journal of School Health, 73*(5), 173-180.

Dake, J. A., Price, J. H., Telljohann, S. K., & Funk, J. B. (2004). Principal perceptions and practices of school bullying prevention activities. *Health Education and Behavior, 31*(3), 372-387.

Dake, J., Price, J., Telljohann, S., & Funk, J. (2003). Teacher perceptions and practices regarding school bullying prevention. *Journal of School Health, 73*(9), 347-355.

Davis, M. R. (2011, February 9). Cyberbullying. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/05/19/32bully_ep.h29.html

Davis, S., & Nixon, C. (2011). What students say about bullying. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(1), 18-23.

DiBlasio, N. (2011, September 11). More bullying cases have parents turning to court. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/ story/2011-09-11/bullying-lawsuits-parents-self-defense-courts/50363256/1

Espelage, D., & Swearer, S. (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.

Gee, B. (2011, June 10). Families awarded $100K each in Wayne County hazing case. *The Tennessean*. Retrieved from http://www.jlftx.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/Families-awarded-100K-each-in-Wayne-County-hazing-case-The-Tennessean-1.pdf

Geiger, R., & Collier, M. (2012, April 3). Deadliest U. S. school shootings. *The San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/02/MNUO1NTQOQ.DTL

Grotpeter, J., & Crick, N. (1996). Relational aggression, overt aggression and friendship. *Child Development, 67*, 2328-2338.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2012). Cyberbullying: Neither an epidemic nor a rarity. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*(5), 539-543.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2013). State cyberbullying laws: A brief review of state cyberbullying laws and policies. Cyberbullying Research Center. Available at http://cyberbullying.us/Bullying_and_Cyberbullying_Laws.pdf.

Isaacs, L. K. A. (2009). *Teachers perceptions of the effectiveness of the Olweus bullying prevention program in hindering bullying behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3368337)

Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, S., Burke, J., & Gielen, A. (2011). Prioritizing the school environment in school violence prevention efforts. *Journal of School Health, 81*(6), 331-340.

Juvonen, J., Graham, S., Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics, 120*(6), 1231-1237.

Kansas State Department of Education. (2012). Bullying prevention legislation. Retrieved from http://www.ksde.org /Default.aspx?tabid=3899

Kennedy, T. D., Russom, A. G., & Kevorkian, M. M. (2012). Teacher and administrator perceptions of bullying in schools. *International Journal of Educational Policy and Leadership, 7*(5), 1-12.

Kenny, M., McEachern, A. G., & Aluede, O. (2005). Female bullying: Prevention and counseling intervention. *Journal of Social Sciences, Special Issue, 8,* 13-19.

Kevorkian, M., & D'Antona, R. (2008). *101 facts about bullying: What everyone should know.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Kochenderfer, B., & Ladd, G. (1996) Peer victimization: Cause or consequence of school maladjustment? *Child Development, 67,* 1305-1317.

Lane, D. E. (2007). *Teacher, staff and parent perceptions of the impact of a bullying prevention training program* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3294806)

Leff, S., Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Power, T. J. (1999). Factors influencing teacher identification of peer bullies and victims. *School Psychology Review, 28*(3), 505-517.

Limber, S. P., & Small, M. A. (2003). State laws and policies to address bullying in schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 445-455.

Lipman, E. L. (2003). Don't let anyone bully you into thinking bullying is not important! *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48*(9), 575-576.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marachi, R., Astor, R., & Benbenishty, R. (2007). Effects of teacher avoidance of school policies on student victimization. *School Psychology International, 28,* 501-518.

Marsh, H. W., Nagengast, B., Morin, A. J. S, Parada, R. H., Craven, R. G., & Hamilton, L. R. (2011). Construct validity of the multidimensional structure of bullying and victimization: An application of exploratory structural equation modeling. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 701-732.

Mulvey, E. P., & Cauffman, E. (2001). The inherent limits of predicting school violence. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 797-802.

Oliver, R., Hoover, J. H., & Hazler, R. (1994). The perceived roles of bullying in small-town midwestern schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 416-420.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (1995). A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 11*(4), 389-402.

Olweus, D., Limber, S., & Mihalic, S. (1999). *Blueprints for violence prevention, book nine: Bullying prevention program*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

One dead in Ohio school shooting; Suspect detained. (2012, February 27). *CBS News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-201_162-57385711/1-dead-in-ohio-school-shooting-suspect-detained/

Operation Respect. (2005). *Educator's Avenue.* Retrieved from http://www.operation respect.org/educators/overview.php

Orobko, A. K. (2009). *An examination of policies, programs, and strategies that address bullying in Virginia public school systems* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3366553)

Orpinas, P., Horne, A. M., & Staniszewski, D. (2003). School bullying: Changing the problem by changing the school. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 431-444.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 4,* 148-169. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9369-x

Pellegrini, A., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F., (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(2), 216-224.

Rigby, K. (2003). The consequences of bullying in schools. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48,* 583-590.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian children and implications for psychological well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(1), 33-42.

Robers, S., Zhang, J., & Truman, J. (2012). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2011* (NCES 2012-002/NCJ 236021). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Sanders, Forrest. (2012). Bullying, sexual assault allegations lead to lawsuit against school system. *WSMV Channel 4*. Retrieved from http://www.wsmv.com/story/18722165/mother-files-lawsuit-against-school-system

Sherer, Y. C. (2007). *Current bullying/intervention practices in American schools: Perspectives on practicing school psychologists* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3300084)

Shulman, R. C. (2003). *Effects of a bully prevention program* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3091293)

Smith, P., Ananiadou, K., & Cowie, H. (2003). Interventions to reduce school bullying. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48*(9), 591-599.

Twemlow, S., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F., Gies, M., Evans, R., & Ewbank, R. (2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: A controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 158*(5), 808-810.

Two dead, six wounded in Kentucky high school shooting. (1997, December 1). *CNN News*. Retrieved from http://articles.cnn.com/1997-12-01/us/9712_01_school shooting.730pm_1_bang-prayer-group-condition-with-gunshot-wounds?_s=PM:US

U.S. Department of Education. (2008). Numbers and types of public elementary and secondary schools from the Common Core of Data: School Year 2006-07. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/pesschools07/glossary.asp

Viadero, D. (2010, May 19). Studies probe ecology of bullying. *Education Week*. *29*, 1-3.

Vidourek, R. A. (2004). *Effectiveness of "Don't Laugh at Me" bully prevention program on decreasing bully behaviors and increasing school connectedness* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. EP26289)

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

Winne, M. (2012). Clayton Co. mother files suit against school district over son's excessive bullying. Retrieved from http://www.wsbtv.com/news/news/clayton-co-mother-files-suit-against-school-distri/nPMmx/

Wiseman, B. (2011). *Cyberbullying in schools: A research study on school policies and procedures* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3460035)

Wolke, D., Woods, S., Bloomfield, L., & Karstadt, L. (2000). The association between direct and relational bullying and behavior problems among primary children. *Child Psychology, 41,* 989-1002.

Wolke, D., Woods, S., Bloomfield, L., & Karstadt, L. (2001). Bullying involvement in primary school and common health problems. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 85*(3), 197-201.

Zande, I. (2012). Face bullying with confidence: 8 skills kids can use right away. Retrieved from www.kidpower.org

Appendices

Appendix A: E-mails from Joseph Dake

From: Megan Dipaola-Allen [mailto:mdipaolaallenbe@olatheschools.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2011 8:29 PM
To: jdake@wayne.edu
Subject: survey

Dear Joseph A. Drake,
My name is Megan DiPaola-Allen and I am a doctoral student at Baker University. In preparing to write my dissertation, I am interested in principals' perceptions of bullying in the state of Kansas. I am writing to ask if I can have a copy of the survey you used in your study so that I could use it/incorporate it into my study.
Thanks,
Megan DiPaola-Allen

From: Dake, Joseph Aaron [mailto:joseph.dake@utoledo.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 04, 2011 1:07 PM
To: Megan Dipaola-Allen
Subject: RE: survey

Hello Megan,

While I wish I had the Word document copy of the instrument to send to you, that was lost with a computer crash a number of years ago. I scanned in a copy of the instrument from my dissertation copy and have attached that for your use. I also assume that you have the article but I have attached that as well in case you needed it.

Best wishes on your study!

-Joe Dake

Joseph A. Dake, PhD, MPH
Associate Professor of Health Education
Chair, Department of Health & Recreation Professions
Mail Stop # 119, Office # 1000c
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606
Office: (419) 530-2767
Fax: (419) 530-4759
jdake@utnet.utoledo.edu

From: Megan Dipaola-Allen [mailto:mdipaolaallenbe@olatheschools.org] **Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2012 2:22 PM **To:** jdake@wayne.edu **Subject:** Survey for Principals' Perceptions/Practices of School Bullying

Dear Dr. Joseph Dake,

Several months ago, I e-mailed you to ask you for the survey you used in your article, Principals' Perceptions and Practices of School Bullying Prevention Activities. At that time, you graciously sent it to me. The reason why I asked for it was because I am going to write my dissertation on the topic of bullying for Baker University and would like to use your survey in my study. You responded that I was welcome to do so.

I am now writing to ask you if I could change one section of your survey. I would like to add a rating scale in the barriers section underneath each heading. I would also like to add some questions in the demographic area that would include the percentage of students receiving free/reduced lunch prices at the school, if the school made adequate yearly progress (AYP) in math/reading, how the school would classify their location (urban, suburban, rural), and a question about school demographics (ethnic break-up of the school). Please let me know if you are okay with the changes. I can also send you the survey with the changes made before you approve. Thanks for you help.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Baker University
Doctoral Student in Educational Leadership

From: Dake, Joseph Aaron [joseph.dake@utoledo.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2012 1:35 PM
To: Megan Dipaola-Allen
Subject: RE: Survey for Principals' Perceptions/Practices of School Bullying

Megan,
You are welcome to use and modify the survey however you feel would best suit your needs.

Best wishes on your research endeavors.

-Joe Dake
Joseph A. Dake, PhD, MPH, FASHA
Chair, Department of Health and Recreation Professions
Mailstop 119, Office #1000c
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
Office: (419) 530-2767
Fax: (419) 530-4759
jdake@utnet.utoledo.edu

Appendix B: IRB Proposal

Date: September 11, 2012

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER

_____

GRADUATE DEPARTMENT (IRB USE ONLY)

IRB REQUEST

Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) **School of Education Graduate Department**

	Name	Signature	
1.	Susan Rogers	_____,	Major Advisor
2.	Katie Schoenhofer	_____,	Research Analyst
3.			University Committee Member
4.			External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Megan DiPaola-Allen _____
Phone: 913-302-6922
Email: mdipaolaallen@yahoo.com
Mailing address: 8812 Golden Lane
De Soto, Kansas 66018

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Susan Rogers
Phone: 913-344-1226
Email: Susan.Rogers@bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: ____Exempt __**X**__Expedited ____Full

II: Protocol Title
Elementary Principals' Perceptions Regarding Bully Prevention Activities

Summary
The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience, and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.
The reduction of bullying in an elementary school setting is directly related to the leadership of the building principal. The focus of the research is on Kansas elementary principals' perceptions of bullying. The purpose of this study is to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in their schools, perceptions regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs in their schools, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. A second purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between elementary principals' perceptions about barriers regarding bullying prevention activities and the implementation of these activities. A third purpose is to examine perceptions regarding barriers to establishing bully prevention activities and implementation of these activities. Finally, elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities will also be examined.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

There will be no manipulation used for this study.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

Participants will be asked to complete a survey that includes demographic information, Likert style items, and multiple select items. A copy of the survey is attached.

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

Participants will not encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

Subjects in this study will not experience stress.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

The subjects in this study will not be deceived or misled in any way.

Will there be a request for information that subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

The subjects involved in this study will be asked to provide personal demographic information. This demographic information includes gender, race/ethnicity, age, highest level of education, years served as a full-time principal, years of teaching experience before becoming a principal, approximate racial distribution of the school, number of training sessions attended regarding bully prevention, and the name of the bully prevention program the school has purchased, if any. Information gathered in this study will not be used to identify individual participants.

Will the subjects be presented with materials that might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

The subjects involved in this study will not be presented with materials, which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The survey will require approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

Kansas elementary principals will be the subjects in this study. Each subject will receive initial contact via e-mail (see attached letter).

What steps will be taken to ensure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

Completion of this survey indicates willingness on the part of the subject to participate. Participants will be advised in the initial contact email that their participation is voluntary. Participants will also be informed in the initial contact email about the opportunity to obtain a copy of the results of the study.

How will you ensure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Completion of the survey will indicate consent of the subject. Participants will be informed of this consent in the initial contact email.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

Data from this survey will not be made part of any permanent record.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No data from this survey about the fact that a subject did or did not participate will be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

Individual names will not be recorded or reported in the results of this study. Identifying information will be reviewed by the researcher and will remain confidential. Information will be stored in a locked file cabinet, which will provide a safe and secure location for the materials. Data will be kept for as long as necessary for completion of the study and then destroyed. Data will not be kept for use in further studies without the knowledge and consent of the participants in the current study.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no risks involved in this study. This study will add to the knowledge gained from previous research that focused on elementary principals' perceptions of bullying. This research will encourage principals to focus on bullying at their schools. The findings of this study will allow elementary principals to examine the importance of their leadership roles to the success of reducing bullying in their schools.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No archival data will be used in this study. All data gathered will be provided by the subjects through their responses on the survey.

Appendix C: IRB Approval Letter

October 5, 2012

Ms. Megan DiPaola-Allen
8812 Golden Lane
De Soto, Kansas 66018

Dear Ms. DiPaola-Allen:

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application (E-0151-0927-1005-G) and approved this project under Expedited Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

The Baker University IRB requires that your consent form must include the date of approval and expiration date (one year from today). Please be aware of the following:

1. At designated intervals (usually annually) until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the IRB.
2. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify the OIR about any new investigators not named in original application.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the IRB Chair or representative immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or myself when this project is terminated. As noted above, you must also provide OIR with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from the IRB one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Doolittle, EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Appendix D: Letter to Principals

Dear Elementary Principals,

My name is Megan DiPaola-Allen and I am a doctoral student at The Baker University School of Education located in Overland Park, Kansas. For my doctoral dissertation, I am completing a research study to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in your school, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Elementary principals' training in bully prevention and their perceptions of the impact of bullying prevention activities will also be examined.

To gather data for my survey, I am asking each elementary principal in the state of Kansas to complete a survey via Survey Monkey titled "Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention". This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. To start the survey, please click on the following link:

By completing this survey, you are willingly consenting to being part of this study. Data from this survey will be used for the sole purpose of this study and will not be reported or recorded in any other way. No data from this survey will become part of any individual's permanent record that could be made available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer. Individual names will not be recorded or reported in the results of this study. If you would like the opportunity to obtain a copy of the results of this survey, please send an email to meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.

This study will add to the knowledge gained from earlier studies that focused on elementary principals' perceptions of bullying. Thanks for taking your time to complete this survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University

Appendix E: Survey

Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention

Directions: Please complete each of the following items according to the instructions. Your responses will be confidential. Thank you for your professional courtesy.

Using the scale, No problem (1) to Major problem (7), please check the box that BEST answers the question.

	No Problem (1)	2	3	4	5	6	Major Problem (7)
1. In your opinion, to what extent is bullying a problem in Kansas elementary schools?							
2. In your opinion, to what extent is bullying a problem in your school?							
3. In your opinion, to what extent is physical bullying a problem in your school?							
4. In your opinion, to what extent is verbal bullying a problem in your school?							
5. In your opinion, to what extent is psychological/mental bullying (e.g., stalking or intimidating) a problem in your school?							
6. In your opinion, to what extent is social bullying a problem in your school?							
7. In your opinion, to what extent is cyberbullying a problem in your school?							
8. In your opinion, to what extent is indirect bullying (e.g., spreading rumors) a problem in your school?							

9. What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school? (Check all that apply)

____ Students would not answer honestly.
____ Administration of a survey about bullying would give the school a poor image.
____ We do not have the resources to address the problems identified in the survey.
____ There is a lack of time for survey administration.
____ We would not know how to develop such a survey.
____ This is not a priority relative other problems with which we deal.
____ Bullying is not a problem in our school.
____ Parents would be opposed to such a survey.
____ Gaining parental consent would be too difficult.
____ The Superintendent would be opposed to such a survey.
____ The School Board would be opposed to such a survey.
____ Other (please specify): _____
____ There would be no barriers.

10. Please check the description that BEST fits your school regarding administration of a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school. (Check one)

    ____ We have not seriously thought about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.
    ____ We have started discussions about administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.
    ____ We are currently taking steps to administer a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.
    ____ Last year was the first time we administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school.
    ____ We have been administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school for two or more years.
    ____ We previously administered a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in our school but we no longer do.

11. What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school? (Check all that apply)

    ____ Teachers are not interested in such a committee.
    ____ Committee work does not result in effective solutions.
    ____ Parents are not interested in being part of this effort.
    ____ There is a lack of time for committee training.
    ____ There is a lack of money to support such a committee.
    ____ There is a lack of knowledge on how to form such a committee.
    ____ This is not a priority relative to other problems with which we deal.
    ____ The Superintendent would be opposed to establishing such a committee.
    ____ The School Board would be opposed to establishing such a committee.
    ____ Other (please specify): _____
    ____ There would be no barriers.

12. Please check the description that BEST fits your school in regards to establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at your school. (Check one)

    ____ We have not seriously thought about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.
    ____ We have started discussions about establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.
    ____ We are currently taking steps to establish a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts at our school.
    ____ Last year was the first year we had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school.
    ____ We have had a "bully prevention committee" to coordinates anti-bullying efforts at our school for two or more years.
    ____ We previously had a "bully prevention committee" that coordinated anti-bullying efforts at our school but we no longer have one.

13. What do you believe would be the barriers for your school to have a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school? (Check all that apply)

    ____ We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which to have a conference day.
    ____ Teachers would not attend.
    ____ Parents would not attend.
    ____ There is a lack of trained staff to effectively coordinate an anti-bullying conference day.
    ____ Having an anti-bullying conference day is a low priority relative to other issues.
    ____ Our school does not have a clear definition of what bullying behavior entails.
    ____ There is a lack of money to hold such a conference day.
    ____ There is not enough time in the school year.
    ____ The Superintendent would be opposed to such a conference day.
    ____ The School Board would be opposed to such a conference day.
    ____ Bullying is not a problem in our school.
    ____ Other (please specify): _____
    ____ There would be no barriers.

14. Please check the description that BEST fits your school with regard to having a conference day at the school for your students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention efforts at your school. (Check one)

    ____ We do not have bully prevention efforts at our school for which we have a conference day.
    ____ We have not seriously thought about having an anti-bullying conference day at the school.
    ____ We have started discussions about having an anti-bullying conference day at our school.
    ____ We are currently taking steps to have an anti-bullying conference day at the school.
    ____ Last year was the first year we had an anti-bullying conference day at the school.
    ____ We have had anti-bullying conference days at the school for at least the last two school years.
    ____ We previously had anti-bullying conference days at the school but no longer have them.

What effect on bullying do you think each of the following would have?

	No Reduction (1)	2	3	4	5	6	Major Reduction (7)
15. Establishing a "bully prevention committee" to coordinate anti-bullying efforts							
16. Holding a conference day at the school for students, parents, and community members in order to raise awareness of bully prevention activities at the school							
17. Administering a survey to the students to assess the extent of bullying in your school							
18. Improving supervision of the outdoor school environment							
19. Improving supervision in the hallways							
20. Improving supervision during lunch time or break time							
21. Having parent-teacher meetings in order to make them aware of bully prevention efforts at the school							
22. Establishing classroom rules specifically against bullying							
23. Establishing positive consequences for students who help prevent bullying problems (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)							
24. Establishing negative consequences for students who bully others (e.g., intervening, reporting, etc.)							
25. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the bully about stopping the behavior							
26. When a bullying situation arises, having serious talks with the victim about ways to prevent further episodes							
27. Contacting the parents of the bullies to make them aware of the situation							
28. Contacting the parents of the victims to make them aware of the situation							
29. Holding a meeting with the bully, the victim, and their parents to discuss the situation and potential solutions							

30. In an average month, how many school related bullying problems are reported to you? (the monthly average over the past two years) _____

	Very Low (1)	2	3	4	5	6	Very High (7)
31. In your opinion, what is the level of violence in the neighborhood immediately surrounding your school? (Check one)							

Demographic Information:

1. What is your gender? ___Female ___Male

2. What is your race/ethnicity? ___African American ___Asian ___ Hispanic ___White ___Other (please specify): _____

3. What is your age? (Check one) ___ less than 30___ 30-39 ___ 40-49 ___ 50-59 ___ 60+

4. What is your highest level of education? ___Bachelors ___ Masters ___Specialist ___Doctorate

5. How many years have you served as a <u>full-time principal</u> (in any school)? _____ years

6. How many years did you <u>teach full-time</u> prior to becoming a principal? _____ years

7. Please describe the approximate racial distribution of your school.
   % White: _____ % African American: _____ % Hispanic: _____ % Other: _____
   (Total = 100%)

8. How many training sessions have you received regarding bully prevention? _____

9. If you currently have a purchased bully prevention program, please identify it.
   _____

Appendix F: Emails Sent to Principals Eliciting Completion of Survey

Sent: October 25, 2012
Dear Elementary Principals,

My name is Megan DiPaola-Allen and I am a doctoral student at Baker University in the School of Education. For my doctoral dissertation, I am completing a research study to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Elementary principals' training in bully prevention will also be examined.

To gather data for my survey, I am asking each elementary principal in the state of Kansas to complete a survey via Survey Monkey titled "Principal's Perception of Bully Prevention". This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. To start the survey, please click on the following link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RWCCM63

By completing this survey, you are willingly consenting to being part of this study. Data from this survey will be used for the sole purpose of this study and will not be reported or recorded in any other way. No data from this survey will become part of any individual's permanent record that could be made available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer. Individual names will not be recorded or reported in the results of this study. If you would like the opportunity to obtain a copy of the results of this survey, please send an email to meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.

This study will add to the knowledge gained from earlier studies that focused on elementary principals' perceptions of bullying. Thanks for taking your time to complete this survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University

Sent: November 5, 2012
Dear Colleague,

A couple of weeks ago you received an email asking for your participation in a survey. This survey is designed to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Since you have attained the position of principal at your current elementary school, I would like to ask for your participation. I realize that you are very busy; the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete. The survey is completely anonymous. It will ask for demographic information and your perceptions of bullying. The survey is available online at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RWCCM63

Your privacy is important; your answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary form. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or school districts. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Your completion and submission of the survey will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information that you have provided in my study.

If you have any questions or if you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.
Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University

Sent: November 13, 2012
Dear Colleague,

A couple of weeks ago you received an email asking for your participation in a survey regarding perceptions of bullying in Kansas elementary schools. I am still in need of 75 participants to make this a viable study.

This survey is designed to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Since you have attained the position of principal at your current elementary school, I would like to ask for your participation. I realize that you are very busy; the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete. The survey is completely anonymous. It will ask for demographic information and your perceptions of bullying. The survey is available online at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RWCCM63

Your privacy is important; your answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary form. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or school districts. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Your completion and submission of the survey will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information that you have provided in my study.

If you have any questions or if you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.
Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University

Sent: November 29, 2012
Dear Colleague,

A couple of weeks ago you received an email asking for your participation in a survey regarding perceptions of bullying in Kansas elementary schools. I am still in need of 40 participants to make this a viable study.

This survey is designed to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Since you have attained the position of principal at your current elementary school, I would like to ask for your participation. I realize that you are very busy; the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete. The survey is completely anonymous. It will ask for demographic information and your perceptions of bullying. The survey is available online at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RWCCM63

Your privacy is important; your answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary form. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or school districts. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Your completion and submission of the survey will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information that you have provided in my study.

If you have any questions or if you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.
Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University

Sent: December 17, 2012
Dear Colleague,

A couple of weeks ago you received an email asking for your participation in a survey regarding perceptions of bullying in Kansas elementary schools. I am still in need of 15 participants to make this a viable study.

This survey is designed to determine principals' perceptions regarding the extent that bullying is taking place in schools, practices regarding the impact of bully prevention activities on the amount of bullying that occurs, and the perceived barriers to establishing bully prevention activities. Since you have attained the position of principal at your current elementary school, I would like to ask for your participation. I realize that you are very busy; the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete. The survey is completely anonymous. It will ask for demographic information and your perceptions of bullying. The survey is available online at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RWCCM63

Your privacy is important; your answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary form. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or school districts. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Your completion and submission of the survey will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information that you have provided in my study.

If you have any questions or if you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at meganedipaola-allen@stu.bakeru.edu.
Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Megan DiPaola-Allen
Doctoral Student, Baker University