

# Internal Stakeholders Perceptions on Bullying: Bases for an Intervention Program

Ms. Emee Daradar Juyamao<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Dr. Democrito Donio Juyamao Jr<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Teacher, English Minoyan Elementary School

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor I, College of Arts and Sciences, STI West Negros University

## Abstract

This study aimed to determine internal stakeholder's perceptions on bullying as basis for an intervention program in the District of Murcia II during the school year 2015-2016. Specifically the study determined internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying in terms of physical, verbal, emotional, and sexual bullying. Likewise, differences in internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying in school were determined. To assess the perceptions on bullying, the researcher utilized the descriptive method of research using the developed research instrument for this purpose. The respondents of this study were the 1297 intermediate pupils, 43 intermediate teachers, and 14 public elementary school administrators in the District of Murcia II. Mean and ANOVA were the statistical tools used to assess respondents perceptions on bullying in school. Results of the study revealed that the extent of internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying is moderate as a whole. Likewise, significant differences were observed among internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying in school. In this regard, the study concluded that bullying happens in school as perceived by internal stakeholders. It is recommended that guidance counselors and teachers are encouraged to develop programs on how to reduce bullying in school. Likewise, they are encouraged to conduct bullying awareness campaign through lectures, activities, and fliers so that pupils will be aware of what bullying is and the acts accompanying it. It is also recommended that bullying intervention in school should be encouraged to be undertaken so that bullying will be minimized.

## INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a common phenomenon observed among all social groups, whether that is within the school, at work or among other social spheres. It can have serious consequences for the target and can arise in many visible and not so visible forms (Cowlin, 2010).

The school is considered as the second home of the students. It is the place where students learn new things, develop their talents and skills, and most especially explore their whole being as they test new grounds to improve what they possess. Students have a feeling of excitement when they meet new people, classmates and teachers; however for a pupil who is being bullied, the school can be a dark hidden place of fear. Within the school environment bullying often occurs out of sight and undetected.

The issue of bullying has been on the agenda of schools worldwide since the last decade (Bauman et al., 2008). In line with current research, schools and some non-governmental organizations have implemented anti-bullying policies to maintain a safe and healthy environment for school children. Schools have developed practices for working closely with parents, for appropriate and effective responses to bullying, and for the rigorous surveillance of playgrounds and whole school activities to help develop constructive interpersonal attitudes and behavior.

In most of the schools in the Philippines bullying is prevalent. A survey that was recently conducted showed that one in two Filipino children witnesses violence or abuse in their schools (Barranta, 2015). It was also prove that students in Philippine schools witness the different types of bullying, which might be verbal such as calling names, being made fun of, or it might be social such as letting the child out of activities by others, or making the student do things he/she did not want to make it in the first place.

The government does keep silent in this issue. In fact, the House of Representatives in the Philippines has approved into law a bill that requires all the elementary and secondary schools to adopt policies that prevent bullying or any other kind of violence in the schools. This law, Republic Act No. 10627, otherwise known as the Anti-Bullying Act of 2013, requires the schools to include the anti-bullying policies in the student and employee handbook. It should be apparent on the wall of the schools, the classrooms and websites. The schools should then submit to the DepEd after six months upon the effect of the law, and any incidents should be reported immediately, and in case of absence of the policies in any school, there is a sanction that falls on the school's administrators.

An essay published online entitled "Bullying Preventions in School" (NetEssays, 2015) states that in today's society, bullying influences thousands of people a day. Children fear going to school due to the physical and emotional pain they receive throughout the day. Bullying leads to teenage problems like depression, suicide and other long term problems. In other words, it needs to be controlled and stopped. Intervention programs should be strictly and properly provided and implemented not just in schools but in all areas where bullying is possible to take place.

In line with this, the researcher was motivated to conduct this study which determined internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying. The results of this study will serve as bases for the formulation of an intervention program.

### **Conceptual Framework of the Study**

This study was anchored on the concepts and theories related to internal stakeholders' perceptions on bullying.

One of the theories which explain the occurrence of bullying is the Ground Relation Theory. This theory states that there has been a consideration that in peer victimization, one can distinguish between being victimized by an individual and being victimized by a group. Individual victimization can only lead to personal harassment while group victimization may occur among individuals in a group or between one or more groups against others (Pikas, 1975). In group victimization, the outcomes become more complex since those who see the bullying activities (bystanders) may then become involved in bullying activities as well. The involvement of bystanders in the bullying activities is merely the result of contextual effects of group norms which work during the victimization (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). In this particular situation, "even if a child empathizes with the victims, and thinks that bullying is wrong, there may be classroom- level influences that encourage him/her to join in bullying, or at least not to show sympathy for the victims" (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). In relation to this, Olweus (1973) argued that it is not surprising that bullying is a group process in which several group mechanisms are involved. Group norms may regulate bullying related behaviors through processes such as peer group pressure and conformity to it (Berndt, 1979).

On the other hand, perception refers to a set of internal sensational cognitive processes of the brain at the subconscious cognitive function layer that detects, relates, interprets, and searches internal cognitive information in the mind (Wang, 2007). Moreover, Radwan (2015), in his online article entitled "How

Perception Affects the Behavior”, concluded that the way people perceive events affects their [behavior](#) to a great extent. Thus, in the present study internal stakeholders’ perceptions of bullying can be related to their behavior towards bullying.

Perceptions of bullying, in this study, focused on physical, verbal, emotional, and sexual form. Physical bullying occurs when a person uses overt bodily acts to gain power over peers. It can include kicking, punching, hitting or other physical attacks. Unlike other types of bullying in schools, it is easy to identify because the acts are so obvious. Physical bullies tend to demonstrate high levels of [aggression](#) from a young age and are more likely to be boys. In addition physical bullying can include harassment, stalking behaviors, and more violent abuses like hitting or intimidating. It can end tragically and therefore must be stopped immediately.

Verbal bullying on the other hand, describes bullying in terms of name-calling, sarcasm, teasing, spreading rumors, threatening, and negative references to one’s culture, ethnicity, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation, unwanted sexual comments. Likewise, it includes insults, mimicking, aggressive use of language, making fun of people, whispering and derogatory remarks.

Furthermore, emotional bullying is something everyone remembers from their childhood. When a person tries to get what they want by making others feel angry or afraid is also considered emotional bullying. Some common effects are depression, low self-esteem, shyness, poor academic performance, isolation, threatened or attempted suicide.

Lastly, sexual bullying according to Michelle (2012) includes sexualized name calling and verbal abuse, ridiculing physical appearance, criticizing one’s sexual performance or behavior, aggressive propositioning, unwanted touching, threatening behavior or physical assault. Jimerson et al. (2010) see sexual harassment and bullying as distinct but overlapping in the respect that they both have the “hallmark characteristics of repetition and intentionality”. Sandler et al. (2005) further clarify that both bullying and sexual harassment intimidate, both are forms of aggression, and both have the potential to harm both the victim and the person committing the aggression.

The intervention program that will be made will be based on the result of this study. Craig and Pepler (2015) said that intervention program for bullying is designed to provide evidence-based plans for action to reduce problems of bullying and victimization and to promote healthy relationships for children, their families, schools, and communities.

## Conceptual Literature

### On Bullying

Bullying is defined by Navarro (2015) as repeated verbal, physical, social or psychological aggressive behavior by a person or group directed towards a less powerful person or group that is intended to cause harm, distress or fear. Likewise, the Anti-Bullying Alliance (2015) defines bullying as the repetitive, intentional hurting of one person or group by another person or group, where the relationship involves an imbalance of power. It can happen face-to-face or through cyberspace.

Mostly people are not aware of what bullying is, its forms and the acts accompanying it .How people understand bullying affects their awareness on the acts they do to others. Bullying on the other hand can be defined as an act of forceful and repeated domineering behavior of the aggressor towards the less powerful person which intended to hurt in a form of verbal (teasing, insulting or calling someone a name, rumors, making fun of way someone looks like and threatening ),emotional (social exclusion, getting others to dislike someone or making others not to talk someone, not being listened to on purpose by another

person and leaving someone intentionally), physical (bumping or pushing, kicking punching or hitting someone intentionally, stealing or taking someone something from someone and intentionally breaking or damaging another peers property) and sexual (sexual labeling/teasing, maliciously looking and inappropriately touching at the private parts of the body and making obscene gestures) .

According to Taylor (2009) there is a belief among some people that human existence sustains itself on the idea that only the strong survive. According to him this ideology is attributed to human nature. He stressed that if we are to believe that “Only the strong survive”, then we can also assume that the problem of bullying in schools is easy to explain, understand, and remediate. Furthermore, he cited authors McCabe and Martin (2005) that noted in their book, *School Violence, The Media, + Criminal Justice Responses*, that school bullying has generally been considered “a rite of passage” for years. The notion that bullying is something that just happens and that the experience of being a victim of bullying must be lived through has changed in the past quarter century Bullying and, by relation, victimization has always been a part of school culture and, to a wider extent, society as a whole. The problem on bullying is seemingly to be the most prevalent in all school environments since most pupils are taking the different acts as normal part of growing up and part of their everyday routine.

Bullying is a widespread problem in our schools and communities and has a negative impact on school climate and on students’ right to learn in a safe and secure environment without fear. Once thought of as a rite of passage or harmless behavior that helps build character, bullying is now known to have long-term academic, physical, and emotional effects on both the victim and the bully (Blazer, 2005).

## **On the Different Forms of Bullying**

### **Physical Bullying**

Taylor (2009) explained that physical bullying can also include the destruction of personal belongings. It is generally believed that physical bullying is the most common type of bullying in schools. Most of the bullying that is shown in popular culture is physical bullying, since it is the most obvious type of bullying. Physical bullying is easy to identify, usually making known to most students in school who is being bullied. Based from the present study physical bullying includes bumping or pushing, kicking punching or hitting someone intentionally, stealing or taking someone something from someone and intentionally breaking or damaging another peer’s property. Younger students engage in less physical bullying than older students and, as the students get older, the physical interactions can become more aggressive and violent. Meaning to say as the student gets older physical bullying becomes more serious and dangerous. According to Jones, et al (2008), physical bullying includes behaviors such as hitting, kicking, or any form of overt violence towards a victim. It tends to receive more attention from school personnel over other forms of bullying. This form of bullying can be easily identified by most school personnel, teachers and school administrators since it uses overt bodily interaction or acts to gain power over victims and left marks or bruises on the body. Physical aggressors tend to demonstrate high level of power of aggression from young victims and are more likely to be boys.

### **Verbal Bullying**

Verbal bullying includes name-calling, threatening, insults and sarcasm whereas relational bullying entails gossiping, hostile gesturing, humiliation and ostracizing victims. According to Bohanon, et al., (2006), verbal bullying also involved teasing, mocking and taunting, for example, being called a teacher’s ‘pet’. Such abusive comments and insults are aimed at making fun, making one unhappy or feeling hurt. This type of bullying is common among girls than boys (Okoth, 2014).

Verbal bullying is a form of bullying that does not include physical interaction, but can be just as harming. The Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) (2001) describes verbal bullying as usually including name-calling or threats. Verbal bullying can also include teasing, spreading rumors, racial slurs, cruel criticism, and blackmailing other students. Verbal bullying is meant to cause distress and embarrassment. Verbal bullying can take place in person, over the phone and in e-mail. The nature of verbal bullying makes it the easiest form of bullying to be overlooked.

### **Emotional Bullying**

[Follingstad, et al.\(2005\)](#) states another form of bullying that happened in school is known as emotional bullying. Emotional bullying is associated to what is known as emotional abuse. Emotional abuse can include verbal assault, dominance, control, isolation, ridicule, or the use of intimate knowledge for degradation. [Gondolf, Heckert, and Kimmel \(2002\)](#) elaborated the effect of emotional bullying and abuse. They stressed that it targets the emotional and psychological well-being of the victim, and it is often a precursor to physical abuse. There is a high correlation between physical abuse and emotional abuse in batterer populations. Thus, there is an emerging emphasis on understanding emotional abuse as a construct separate from physical abuse, worthy of its own theories and prevention strategies ([O'Leary & Maiuro, 2001](#)). This form of bullying is considered as one of the most alarming form of bullying since it has a long term effect on the psychological well-being of the victim. Victims can suffer from depression, low self-esteem, anxiety, and even commit suicide. Mostly, emotional bullying is something that a person remembers from his/her childhood because of the traumatic effect and experience brought to the lives of the victims.

### **Sexual Bullying**

Fredland, et al (2005)states that sexual bullying behaviors are most prevalent between sixth and eighth grades and then the incidence of bullying behaviors appears to decline, but according to them this does not necessarily mean that tendency toward bullying also decreases. Two possible explanations were given. First the victims stop reporting or the bullying changes form and second imitating more adult behaviors, such as sexual bullying or dating violence. Sexual bullying is proposed as a relatively new and related concept that bridges the gap between early adolescent bullying and dating violence that usually occurs later in adolescence, young adulthood, and adulthood. Sexual bullying terminology is more easily associated with the middle-school-age group than some terms currently used to describe behaviors of very young adolescents.

The Anti-Bullying Alliance (2015) reported that schools often struggle to communicate messages about appropriate sexual behavior to children and young people and may feel even more out of their depth when it comes to children with special educational needs or particular disabilities. There may be a misconception that these children and young people are not interested in sex, or that it would be somehow inappropriate to discuss sexual matters with them however this only serves to leave children vulnerable to bullying and abuse. Each year, significant numbers of children face exclusion from school for sexual misconduct including children with disabilities and children in special schools.

According to Anti-Bullying Alliance (2015) the type of behavior within a school environment that could constitute sexual bullying, or could contribute to an environment where sexual bullying is more likely to occur includes: sexual comments, taunts and threats, inappropriate physical contact that makes the recipient feel uncomfortable or scared (this can include hugging and kissing), distributing sexual material (including pornography); sending photos or videos of a sexual nature, making phone calls and sending texts or messages of a sexual nature, games' with a sexual element that may make a child or young person

feel uncomfortable or scared (e.g. taking clothes off, kissing or touching games), Pressure to spend time alone or apart from others with another person, or people, that makes the person feel uncomfortable or scared (e.g. behind school buildings, in the toilets or changing rooms, in the field) and pressure to be in a relationship with another person, or to engage in a sexual act with another person both inside and outside of school .

According to the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, (2001) the problem with sexual bullying is not limited to female students, as some may believe. In addition sexual bullying is defined by this association as a behavior that is based on a person's sexuality or gender characteristics. Students who are sexual bullies can be either boys or girls, and the bullying can be carried out directly or indirectly. Sexual bullying based on a person's sexual preference usually pertains to bullying that is homophobic in nature. Unwanted words and actions describe sexual bullying. Moreover, it is stressed by Taylor (2009) that some behaviors that are associated with sexual bullying include: sexual jokes, taunts, and/or comments, teasing or spreading rumors regarding sexual orientation or sexual activities, unwarranted sexual physical contact, and unwanted sexual displays.

### **Causes and Effects of Bullying**

Different scholars explain causes of bullying in different ways. Omoteso (2010) explains that personality characteristics and typical reaction patterns, combined with the level of physical strength or weakness in the case of boys, can help to explain the development of bullying problems in individual students. At the same time, environmental influences, such as teachers' attitudes, behaviors and supervisory routines play a crucial role in determining the extent to which these problems manifest themselves in a classroom or a school. Also, parents who model aggression as a way of meeting their needs, or who use harsh or aggressive methods of discipline are significantly more likely to have children who engage in aggression or bullying. In addition, it is said that children are great imitators, they can be easily influenced by their environment, by the behavior of people around them whom they interact and part of their daily routine, so if they always witnessed unwanted or aggressive behavior it is already expected that in turn they will also do the same.

Likewise, Bowers, et al (1992) maintains that, children who have experienced child abuse or witnessed domestic partner abuse or been bullied by their siblings and had mothers who were rejecting, cold or indifferent are likely to become bullies. Bullies are also motivated by the desire to appear influential. Reporting on bullying at schools, Olweus (1993) asserts that parenting styles also play an important role in the development of bullying behavior in young children.

Bullying is pervasive and terribly harmful for bullies, victims, schools and communities (Omoteso, 2010). Victims often have difficulties in concentrating on their schoolwork and may experience a decline in academic performance. They have higher than normal absenteeism and dropout rates and may show signs of loneliness as well as having trouble in making social and emotional adjustments, difficulty in making friends, and poor relationships with classmates (Lumsden, 2002).

Victims of bullying according to Shellard (2002), often suffer humiliation, insecurity, and loss of self-esteem and may develop a fear of going to school. In the similar vein, Olweus (1991), Pepler and Craig (2000) maintain that victims often fear school and consider it an unhappy and unsafe place. Students who are targeted by bullies often have difficulty concentration on their school work and their academic performances tend to be "marginal to poor" (Ballard, et al 1999). It was, explained by Omoteso (2010) that victims of bullying are not the only ones who are adversely affected but also those who bully are more likely to drop out of school, use drug and alcohol, as well as engage in subsequent delinquent and criminal

behavior.

The effects of being victimized by bullying does not necessarily end when a victim changes schools, enters a new grade, or even graduates. Victims of bullying are prone to psychiatric problems and smoking in adulthood. Victims are also more likely to have less financial success, have difficulty holding a job, and have more difficulty with social interactions in adulthood (Costello, et al 2013).

### **On Bullying Intervention**

Dupper and Meyer-Adams (2002) recommend that the focus of intervention should not be the perpetrators and victims alone and feel “effective intervention must happen at multiple levels, concurrently”. Along with joining forces with parents, they suggest school-level interventions such as conflict resolution and diversity training for staff and students. They also suggest classroom-level interventions such as allotted time for classroom discussions, role playing, and other activities promoting awareness to character education, citizenship and community building, and conflict resolution.

Intervention should begin early, focusing on attitudes against bullying and perceiving the perpetrator negatively. Interventions for children should not only be directed to students who show characteristics of a bully or a victim, but should be preventative in nature for all students (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Bullying should be viewed as a negative behavior and not as a deserving behavior for any student. Salmivalli (2001) reported that it is helpful to give students an opportunity to take responsibility when a bullying episode occurs. Sheras (2002) provided simple intervention tactics for students. Students can assertively ask a bully to stop, ask friends to help, notify adults of what is going on and continue to let adults know if the bullying continues. Salmivalli (2001) noted though, that it is also necessary for students to understand when things are too out of hand for them to be involved, in which case adults need to have ultimate responsibility for reducing bullying in the school.

Student influence can negatively or positively affect a bully situation. A peer onlooker of bullying is defined as child who is watching the bullying episode for at least five seconds of any portion of the episode. There are peer interveners, as well. They are students who physically or verbally end the bully-victim interaction (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Peer onlookers are unhelpful in reducing bullying behavior, while peer interveners help to stop bullying episodes. Students can be effective in the fight against negative actions among their peers, but it takes courage and support from adults in the school.

An onlooker of a bullying situation attempts to avoid the situation, for fear they may be the next victim if there is an attempt to intervene (Beane, 1999).

The Anti-Bullying Alliance (2015) reiterated that schools have a duty to create an environment where sexism is not tolerated; where personal space of students and staff is respected; where sexist language and comments are challenged, and where students and staff feel empowered to say no to any unwanted touch. Newman, et al. (2000) indicate some core conditions for teachers to maintain to help in the intervention and reduction of bullying behaviors. Some of those conditions are: be a role model to set precedents and guide students, understand the different forms of bullying, be observant of the behaviors in the classroom which can allow for awareness of bullying situations, and believe in the ability to make a difference with students.

Teachers, if they are aware of the behaviors, can be instrumental in the cessation of bullying in schools. Some research suggests that the principal’s commitment and involvement in preventing and controlling bullying contributes to lower rates of bullying (Farrington, 1993). As the building leader, the principal should take their initiative in actively promoting anti-bullying behaviors. He or she must educate staff about the characteristics of bullies and victims, as well as the immediate and long-term consequences of

bullying. The principal must also communicate to staff and students that aggressive behavior is not a normal part of development and that being bullied does not help victims “toughen up” (Shellard, 2002). This means that school administrators should do their part as responsible of the administration of strict implementation of school based intervention tactics that will help combat bullying incidents in school. Ross (2002), summarizing Olweus’ work, states “bullying is intentional, a purposeful act, and consequently, one that can be controlled provided that there is strong commitment and willingness to work together on the part of all involved: school personnel, other professionals, parents, and children”. However, as stated above, before schools can effectively put a whole-school plan into place some groundwork must be securely laid down first. In this ground work, principals are vital in the success of the program they implement in their schools (Hathorn, 2002). They are the conductors of each category needed in a successful program. Principals must hold students and staff accountable for their roles in changing the climate of the school and they must allow for the time and manpower implementing a new program will take. Ross (2002) explains that first a solid code of conduct must be in place and operating smoothly. These clearly stated rules communicate to all students and staff what the expectation is for behaviour and they must be “enforced without exception”.

### **On Intervention Program for Bullying**

Fonagy, et al. (2005) found that elementary students who attended schools where a bullying and violence prevention program was in place for 2 years or more had higher achievement than a matched comparison group of students in control schools that did not have the bullying prevention program. Moreover, academic achievement decreased among students who left schools with the program and moved to schools that did not. Thus, although the relationship between bullying and school performance is a complex one, the challenge for educators is to create a safe learning environment so that all students can achieve optimally in school.

The said study supports the present study that an appropriate intervention program is a must in order to create healthy and safe environment for pupils. It is believed that once the school environment is free from any aggressive or unwanted behavior school children can perform well in their academics. Moreover, through an intervention program pupils will learn to love school, enhance social interaction, develop self-esteem, improved peer acceptance, increase awareness on the effect of bullying and will learn to refrain in doing unwanted behavior.

Likewise, Merrell, et al. (2008) stressed that an intervention program will enhance teachers’ knowledge of effective practices, feelings of efficacy regarding intervention skills, and actual behavior in responding to incidences of bullying at school; and, to a lesser extent, in reducing participation by students in bully and victim roles. Thus, school intervention plays an important role in creating healthy relationship among pupils, teachers, school administrators and other educational stakeholders.

Dupper and Meyer-Adams (2002) recommend that the focus of intervention should not be the perpetrators and victims alone. They feel “effective intervention must happen at multiple levels, concurrently”. Along with joining forces with parents, they suggest school-level interventions such as conflict resolution and diversity training for staff and students. They also suggest classroom-level interventions such as allotted time for classroom discussions, role playing, and other activities promoting awareness to character education, citizenship and community building, and conflict resolution.

The above study also deals with intervention program focusing not only on the victim and the bullies but it is extended on all stakeholders including parents.

Hester, et al (2012), in their study on cyber bullying intervention set a purpose to better understand how



cyber bullying affects school system stakeholders and gather ideas about how school officials should properly address it. The researchers in this case study collected and analyzed stakeholders' perceptions regarding cyber-bullying effects upon their school system and how schools should address it. This school system is located in southeastern U.S. The researcher used focus group interviews to collect data from four stakeholder groups: school administrators, school counselors, parents, and external authorities. The researcher used content analysis to identify significant data and organized, reported, and discussed the results in two distinct ways: 1) grouping results based on their connection to the study's research questions, and 2) grouping results into five themes through the use of thematic coding. The discussion of results, implications for stakeholders, and recommendations for future research are based on data connections with the research questions and the development of the five themes. The results, stakeholders' implications, and recommendations for future research include ideas regarding stakeholder partnerships, education awareness programs, school disciplinary action, parental supervision and control, and other ideas concerning stakeholder relationships and trust.

Although this form of bullying is not in the scope of this study, however, this was cited by the researcher because the respondents were almost the same as respondents used in the present study. Similarities on the other hand can be traced from the fact that it all deal with bullying in school.

Both conceptual and research studies reviewed stress that bullying is prevalent in all schools both be in local or in foreign setting. Moreover, the review of related literature reiterated the importance of appropriate intervention programs and a collective collaboration among stakeholders in order to reduce bullying in school.

The review identifies the different forms of bullying such as verbal, emotional, physical and sexual. Furthermore, the review also enumerated the different acts accompanying the different forms of bullying. Like the other studies, this study also measures the perceptions of the internal stakeholders on bullying as a whole and in different forms. Their perceptions are compared to check if they differ significantly. The results will be the bases for the intervention program

Along this contention, the review of literature and studies related to the recent investigation has helped the researcher in formulating the framework of the present scientific inquiry, in analysis and consequent discussions of the result of the study.

### **Research Instrument**

The research instrument used in this study was a researcher-made instrument. This consisted of items belonging to each of the types of bullying: physical, verbal emotional and sexual. Each of these types consisted of five items with five options for the respondents to choose from. The researcher also gained some ideas from previous researches and studies which led to the formulation of the instrument. Some of the items were adopted from the study on student teachers' perceptions on bullying in school conducted by Kamla-Raj (2014). The research instrument was translated to Hiligaynon for better understanding of the respondents specifically the intermediate pupils.

The research instrument used in determining internal Stakeholder's perceptions of bullying was subjected to validity. Using criteria developed for evaluating survey questionnaire set forth by Carter V. Good and Douglas V. Scates. In this manner, the research instrument was presented to the three jurors who were considered experts in the field of education, curriculum, and research. They went over the research instrument item-by-item and judged the suitability and appropriateness of the questions. Recommendations for improvement were taken into consideration and were given due consideration by

the researcher. The mean rating obtained from the three jurors was 4.56. This obtained mean showed that the research instrument was very good and was valid to a very high degree.

On the other hand, to determine the reliability of the research instrument, the developed research instrument was pilot tested to 50 intermediate pupils of Murcia District I. These dry run participants were not the actual participants of the study. In the process of determining whether the research instrument was reliable or not, Cronbach Alpha was used. The Cronbach Alpha is used whenever the researcher has items that are not scored simply as right or wrong (Carlson, 2004).

The computed alpha was 0.93. According to Ornstein (1983), a coefficient of 0.80 or higher indicates high reliability. This means that the research instrument developed by the researcher was reliable to a high degree.

### Summary of Findings

The following are the findings of the study after which appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics were used:

1. The extent of school administrators and intermediate teachers' perception on bullying as a whole was negligible but pupils' perception was moderate.
2. Bullying in terms of the different forms was negligible except on verbal bullying which was moderate.
3. The extent of intermediate teachers' perception on emotional and sexual bullying is negligible except on verbal and physical bullying which was moderate.
4. The extent of intermediate pupils' perception on different forms of bullying is moderate except on verbal bullying which was great.
5. There is a significant difference in the extent of internal stakeholders' perceptions on verbal, emotional, physical and sexual forms of bullying.

### Conclusions

Based from the findings, the following conclusions were advanced:

1. The extent of school administrators' perceptions on bullying as a whole and in terms of the different forms was negligible except on verbal bullying which was moderate.
2. Results on intermediate teachers' perceptions when taken as a whole and in terms of the different forms were negligible except on verbal and physical bullying which was moderate.
3. Concerning intermediate students' perceptions on the different forms of bullying were moderate except on verbal bullying which was great.
4. Internal stakeholders differ significantly in their extent of perception on verbal, emotional, physical and sexual bullying.

### REFERENCES

1. Aboud, F., & Miller, L. (2007). Promoting peer intervention in name-calling. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37, 803-819.
2. Ahmed, Y., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Bullying in schools and the issue of sex differences. In J. Archer (Ed.), *Male violence*. London: Routledge.
3. Anti-Bullying Alliance 2015. [www.anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/advice/parents-and-carers.aspx](http://www.anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/advice/parents-and-carers.aspx)

4. Astor, R. A., Meyer, H. M., & Pitner, R. O. (2001).Elementary and middle school students' perceptions of violence-prone school subcontexts. *Elementary School Journal*, 101, 511-528.
5. Atlas, R., & Pepler, D. J. (1998).Observations of bullying in the classroom.*American Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 86±99.
6. Ballard M., Argus T., & Rempely T. P. (1999) *Bullying and School Violence: A proposed Prevention Program*, NASSP Bulletin, 2, 38-47.
7. Bandyopadhyay, et al., (2009). Internal and external validity of three school climate scales from the School Climate Bullying Survey. *School Psychology Review*, 38, 338-355.
8. Barranta, M. (2015) *Philippines Issues On School / Classroom Bullying*.
9. Barrows, Michelle L.,(2013)."School Adult and Student Perceptions of Bullying in Middle School: A Mixed Methods Case Study" (2013). Masters Theses. Paper 45.
10. Batsche, G. M., & Knoff, H. M. (1994). Bullies and their victims: understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. *School Psychology Review*, 23, 165±174.
11. Bauman, A., et al.,(2008). *Getting Australia moving: Barriers, facilitators and interventions to get more Australians physically active through cycling*.Funded by the Australian Government, Department of Health and Ageing.Cycling Promotion Fund, Melbourne.
12. Beane, A. L. (1999). *The bully free classroom*, Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing Co.
13. Beran, T. (2008).Consequences of being bullied at school. In D. Pepler& W. Craig (Eds.), *Understanding and Addressing Bullying: An International Perspective* (pp. 44-66). Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse.
14. Blazer C (2005). *Literature Review on Bullying*. Retrieved October 11, 2006, from <http://drs.dadeschools.net/ Reports/Bullying.pdf>
15. Bowers, L., Smith, P. K., & Binney, V. (1992). Cohesion and power in the families of children involved in the bully/victim problems at school. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 14, 371±387
16. Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Preventing bullying through positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS): A multi-tiered approach to prevention and integration.*Theory into Practice*, 52, 288 –295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829732>.
17. Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 361–382.
18. Branson, C.,& Cornell, D. (2009). A comparison of self and peer reports in the assessment of middle school bullying.*Journal of Applied School Psychology*. 25, 5-27.
19. Brockenbrough, K., Cornell, D., & Loper, A. (2002).Aggressive victims of violence at school. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 25, 273-287.
20. Byrne, B. (1994). Bullies and victims in a school setting with reference to some Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 15, 574-586.
21. Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1994). *Lifelines and Risks: Pathways of Youth in Our Time*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
22. Chesir-Teran, D. (2003). Conceptualizing and addressing heterosexism in high schools: A setting-level approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 269-279.
23. Coker, A., et al. (2002).Physical and Mental Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence for Men and Women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260-268.

24. Coker, A. L., et al.,(2000).Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Archives of Family Medicine*, 9(5), 451-457.
25. Cornell, D. G., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2010). The assessment of bullying. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of Bullying in Schools: An International Perspective* (pp. 265- 276). New York: Routledge.
26. Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Huang, F., & Fan, X. (2013). Perceived prevalence of bullying and teasing predicts high school dropout rates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 138-149.
27. Craig, W. &Pepler, D. (2014).*Bullying Prevention and Intervention in the School Environment*.
28. Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1995). Peer processes in bullying and victimization: a naturalistic study. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, 4, 81±95.
29. Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000).Observations of bullying in the playground and in the classroom. *School Psychology International*, 21, 22-36.
30. Craig, W., & Pepler, D. J. (1997).Observations of bullying and victimisation on the schoolyard.*Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 2, 41±60.
31. Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial
32. behavior in the prediction of children’s future social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 2317-2327.
33. Crick, N. R., & Bigbee, M. A. (1998). Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: A multiinformant approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 337–347.
34. Dahlheimer, J. M. (2004). Teachers 'perceptions of bullying behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin.
35. Retrieved January 3 1, 2005 from [http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/2004/2004dahlheimerj .pdf](http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/2004/2004dahlheimerj.pdf)
36. Dupper, D. R., & Meyers-Adams, N. (2002). Low-level violence: a neglected aspect of school culture. *Urban Education*, 37(3), 350-364.
37. Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. In R. Geffner & M. Loring (Eds.), *Bullying Behaviors: Current Issues, Research, and Interventions*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
38. Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2009). Contributions of three social theories to understanding bullying perpetration and victimization among school-aged youth. In M. J. Harris (Ed.), *Bullying, Rejection, and Peer Victimization: A Social Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective* (pp. 151-170). New York: Springer.
39. Espelage, D. L., et al., (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37, 202-216.
40. Espelage, D. L., Green, H., Jr., & Wasserman, S. (2007). Statistical analysis of friendship patterns and bullying behaviors among youth. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 118, 61-75.
41. Espelage, D. L., Holt, M. K., & Henkel, R. R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. *Child Development*, 74, 205-220.
42. Farrington D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice*, vol. 17 (pp. 381-458). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
43. Follingstad, D.R., Coyne, S., & Gambone, L. (2005). A representative measure of psychological aggression and its severity. *Violence & Victims* , 20, 25-38.

44. Fonagy, P., et al., (2005). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: The impact of an antibullying program on educational attainment in elementary schools. *Medical Science Monitor*, 11, 317-325.
45. Frey, K. S., et al. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 466-481.
46. Fried, S., & Fried, P. (1996). *Bullies and Victims: Helping Your Child through the Schoolyard Battlefield*. New York: M. Evans.
47. Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N., and Short-Camilli, C. (1996). *Bully-Proofing Your School: A Comprehensive Approach*. Reclaiming children and youth. (Spring 1996), pp. 35-39.
49. Glew, G. M., Fan, M., Katon, W., Rivara, F. P., & Kernic, M. A. (2005). Bullying, psychosocial adjustment, and academic performance in elementary school. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, 159, 1,026-1,031.
50. Goldbaum, S., Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Connolly, J. (2003). Developmental trajectories of victimization: Identifying risk and protective factors. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 139-156.
51. Gondolf, E.W., D.A. Heckert and C.M. Kimmel (2002). Nonphysical Abuse Among Batterer Program Participants. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17(4), 293-314.
52. Graham, S. (2009). Some myths and facts about bullies and victims. In S. Hymel & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying at school and online* [Special edition of Education.com]. Retrieved May 1, 2009, <http://www.education.com/topic/school-bullying-teasing/>
53. Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998). A social cognitive perspective on peer aggression and victimization. *Annals of Child Development*, 13, 21-66.
54. Graham, S., Bellmore, A., & Juvonen, J. (2003). Peer victimization in middle school: When self- and peer views diverge. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 117-137.
55. Griffith, J. (1996). Relation of parental involvement, empowerment, and school traits to students' academic performance. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90, 33-41.
56. Gümüşeli, Ali İlke, Hacifazlıoğlu, Özge & Çakmak, Esra (2014) Student Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying in Schools.
57. Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of patterns of adjustment following peer victimization. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 69-89.
58. Harris, S. & Hathorn, C. (2006). Texas middle school principals' perceptions of bullying on campus. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bulletin*. Retrieved March 17, 2007 from <http://www.findarticles.com>.
59. Hawkins, D. J., Catalano, R. F., & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105.
60. Herrera, C. et al. (2007), *Making a Difference in Schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters School-based Mentoring Impact Study*, Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
61. Hester, Wesley P. et. al. (2012) *Cyber bullying Intervention: A Case Study Analysis Of Stakeholder Perceptions Regarding The Authority Of School Administrators In Addressing Cyber bullying Issues*.

62. Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R. L., & Thomson, K. A. (1993). Perceived victimization by school bullies: New research and future direction. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 32, 76-84.
63. Huber, J. D. (1983). Comparison of disciplinary concerns in small and large schools. *Small School Forum*, 4, 7-9.
64. Isom, James C. (2014) Understanding Teacher Perceptions of Bullying and Effectiveness of an Anti-bullying Policy: A Case Study of Suburban High School Teachers in the Southwestern U.S.
65. Jacobsen, K. E., & Bauman, S. (2007). Bullying in schools: School counselors' responses to three types of bullying incidents. *Professional School Counseling*, 11, 1-9.
67. Janssen, I., Craig, W. M., Boyce, W. F., & Pickett, W. (2004). Associations between overweight and obesity with bullying behaviors in school-aged children. *Pediatrics*, 113, 1,187- 1,194.
68. Jeffrey, L. R., Miller, D., & Linn, M. (2001). Middle school bullying as a context for the development of passive observers to the victimization of others. In R. A. Geffner, M. Loring, & C. Young (Eds.), *Bullying behavior: Current issues, research, and interventions* (pp. 143-156). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
69. Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of Bullying in Schools: An International Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
70. Jones, N., Moore, K., Villar-Marques, E., (2008) Painful lessons: The politics of preventing sexual violence and bullying at school, ODI.
71. Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) (2001). Hostile hallways: Bullying, teasing, and sexual harassment in schools. New York: Author.
72. Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics*, 112, 1,231-1,237.
73. Kasen, S., Berenson, K., Cohen, P., & Johnson, J. G. (2004). The effects of school climate on changes in aggressive and other behaviors related to bullying. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American Schools: A Social Ecological Perspective on Prevention and Intervention* (pp. 187- 210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
74. Kasen, S., Cohen, P., & Brook, J. S. (1998). Adolescent school experiences and dropout, adolescent pregnancy, and young adult deviant behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 13, 49-72.
75. Kasen, S., Johnson, J., & Cohen, P. (1990). The impact of school emotional climate on student psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18, 165-177.
76. Kashahu, L., Dibra, G., Osmanaga, F., & Bushati, J. (2014). The relationship between parental demographics, parenting styles and student academic achievement. *European Scientific Journal*, 10, 237-251.
77. Kaukiainen, A., et al. (1999). The relationships between social intelligence, empathy, and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 81-89.
78. Kaukiainen, A., et al. (2002). Learning difficulties, social intelligence, and self-concept: Connections to bully-victim problems. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 43, 269-278.
79. Keashly, L. (1998). "Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: Conceptual and Empirical Issues." *Journal of Emotional Abuse*. 1:1, pp.85-117.
80. Keashly, L., Harvey, S. (2005). Emotional abuse in the workplace. In *Counterproductive workplace behavior*. Eds. S. Fox, P. Spector. Washington, DC : APA press.

81. Kennedy, Tom, et. al. (2009) Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Bullying in Schools. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*.
82. Kochenderfer, R., & Ladd, G. W. (1996). Peer victimization: Cause or consequence of school maladjustment? *Child Development*, 67, 1305-1317.
83. Kosciw, J. G., & Diaz, E. M. (2006). *The 2005 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Our Nation's Schools*. New York: GLSEN.
84. Kosciw, J. G., Diaz, E. M., & Greytak, E. A. (2008). *The 2007 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Our Nation's Schools*. New York: GLSEN.
85. Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Henttonen, I. (1998). Children involved in bullying: Psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 23, 1,253-1,262.
86. Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Puura, K. (2001). Psychiatric disorders and the use of mental health services among children involved in bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 27, 102-110.
87. Lacey, A., & Cornell, D. (2013). The impact of bullying climate on schoolwide academic performance. *Journal of Applied School Psychology* 29, 262-283.
88. Ladd, G. W. (2003). Probing the adaptive significance of children's behavior and relationships in the school context: A child by environment perspective. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (pp. 43-104). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
89. Little, L. (2002). Middle-class mothers' perceptions of peer and sibling victimization among children with Asperger's syndrome and nonverbal learning disorders. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 25, 43-57.
90. Llewellyn, A. (2000). Perceptions of mainstreaming: A systems approach. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 42, 106-115.
91. Marini, Z., Fairbairn, L., & Zuber, R. (2001). Peer harassment in individuals with developmental disabilities: Towards the development of a multidimensional bullying identification model. *Developmental Disabilities Bulletin*, 29, 170-195.
92. McCabe, K. & Martin, G.M.(2005). *School violence, the media, and criminal justice responses*. New York: Peter Lang.
93. Mehta, S., Fan, X., & Gregory, A. (2013). Bullying climate and school engagement in ninth grade students. *Journal of School Health*, 83, 45-52.
94. Merrell, Kenneth W., Barbara A. Gueldner, Scott W. Ross, and Duane M. Isava.( 2008). "How Effective Are School Bullying Intervention Programs? A Meta-Analysis of Intervention Research." *School Psychology Quarterly* 23(1):26–42.
95. Michelle, A. (2014). *Preventing Sexual Harassment, Sexual Bullying, Sexual Abuse, Acquaintance Rape, and Date Rape Among Students at Middletown High*
96. Mwangi, M. (2008, Thurs., Feb.14 th ). 'The Day School's Annual Ritual Turned Tragic.' *Daily Nation, Nairobi*: NMG, p. 3.
97. Nansel, T. R., Haynie, D. L., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2003). The association of bullying and victimization with middle school adjustment. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 45-61.
98. Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., SimonsMorton, B. G., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285, 2,094-2,100.
99. Navarro, A. (2015) What is Bullying?

100. Ndetei, D., Ongecha, F., Khasakhala, L., Syanda, J., Mutiso, V., Othieno, C., Odhiambo, G., & Kokonya, D. (2007). Bullying in public secondary schools in Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 19(1), 45-55
101. Ndibalema, P. (2013). Perceptions about bullying behaviour in secondary schools in Tanzania. The case of Dodoma Municipality. *International Journal of Education and Research*, Vol. 1 (5) :1-16.
102. Newgent, R., Lounsbury, K., Keller, E., Baker, C., Cavell, T., & Boughfman, E. (2009).
103. Differential perceptions of bullying in the schools: A comparison of student, parent, teacher, school counselor, and principal reports. *Journal of School Counseling*, 7, 1-33.
104. Newman, D. A., A.M. Horne, and L. Bartolomucci. (2000). *Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims and Bystanders.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.
105. Newman-Carlson, D. & Horne, A. M. (2004). Bully busters: A psycho-educational intervention for reducing bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, (82), 259-268.
106. Norwich, B., & Kelly, N. (2004). Pupils' views on inclusion: Moderate learning difficulties and bullying in mainstream and special schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30, 43-65.
107. Nyasato, R. (2009, March 18 th ). "Nyambaria Boys expels six Form-four bullies". E.A Standard. Nairobi: SMG p. 26.
108. Okoth, Ochura J. (2014) Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on Bullying Behaviour in Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District, Kisumu County, Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy
109. O'Leary, K. D. & Maiuro, R. D. (2001). *Psychological abuse in domestically violent relationships*. Sage: Newbury Park, CA. *Articles on Marriage and Family*
110. Ontario education Act 2009. Ontario Ministry of Education [www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/safeschools/bullying.html](http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/safeschools/bullying.html)
111. Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention programme. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
112. Olweus, D. (1992). Bullying among schoolchildren: Intervention and prevention. In R. D. Meters, R. J. McMahon, & V. L. Quinsey (Eds.), *Aggression and Violence throughout the Life Span* (pp. 100-125). London: Sage
113. Olweus, D. (1993a). Victimization by peers: antecedents and long term outcomes. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorff (Eds.), *Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
114. Olweus, D. (1995). Bullying or peer abuse in school: intervention and prevention. In G. Davies et al. (Eds.), *Psychology, law and criminal justice: international developments in research and practice* (pp. 248±263). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
115. O'Moore, A. M., & Hillery, B. (1989). Bullying in Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 10, 426±441.
116. Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2006). *Bullying Prevention: Creating a Positive School Climate and Developing Social Competence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
117. Paine, S. & McCann, R. (2009). *Engaging Stakeholders*.



118. Pedrosa, Mayla T. (2014) “Multisectoral Consciousness on Bullying in School: Basis for Intervention”. Unpublished Thesis. Philippine Normal University Visayas. Cadiz City, Negros Occidental.
119. Radwan, Farouk (2015). How Perception Affects the Behavior. [www.2knowmyself.com/](http://www.2knowmyself.com/). Retrieved March 11, 2015.
120. Rivers, I. (2001). The bullying of sexual minorities at school: its nature and long-term correlates. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 18, 33±46.
121. Rodkin, P. C., Farmer, T. W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2006). They’re cool: Ethnic and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. *Social Development*, 36, 14-24.
122. Ross, D. M. (2002). Bullying. In J. Sandoval (Ed.), *Handbook of crisis counseling, intervention and prevention in schools* (pp. 105-135). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
123. Rutter, M., et al. (1979). *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
124. Salmivalli, C., &Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms and behavior associated with bullying in schools. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 246-258.
125. Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., &Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996). How do the victims respond to bullying? *Aggressive Behaviour*, 22(2), 99±109.
126. Salmivalli, C., Karna, A., &Poskiparta, E. (2010). Development, evaluation, and diffusion of a national anti-bullying program (KiVA). In B. Doll, W. Pfohl, & J. Yoon (Eds.), *Handbook of Youth Prevention Science*. New York: Routledge.
127. Salmivalli, C., Karna, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Counteracting bullying in Finland: The KiVa program and its effects on different forms of being bullied. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(5), 405–411.
129. Sandler, Bernice Resnick., and Harriett M. Stonehill. *Student-to-student Sexual Harassment, K-12: Strategies and Solutions for Educators to Use in the Classroom, School, andCommunity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education, 2005. Print.
130. Shellard, E. (2002). *Recognizing and Preventing Bullying*. The Informed Educator Series. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
131. Simatwa EMW (2007). *Management of Student Discipline in Secondary Schools in Bungoma District, Kenya*. PhD Thesis. Maseno University.
132. Slee, P. T. (1993). Bullying: A preliminary investigation of the nature and effects on social cognition. *Early Child Development and Care*, 87, 47-57.
133. Smith P. K., & Sharp, S. (1994). The problem of school bullying. In P. K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), *School bullying: insights and perspectives*. London: Routledge.
134. Smith, P. K. & Shu, S. (2000) What good schools can do about bullying: findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action, *Childhood*, 7(2), 193–212.
135. Spiel, C. & Strohmeier, D. (2011). National Strategy for Violence Prevention in the Australian Public School System: Development and Implementation. *International Journal of Behavioural Development* 35 (5): 412-418.
136. Stevens, V., Van Oost, P., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2000). The effects of an anti-bullying intervention programme on peers’ attitudes and behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 21- 34.
137. Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., & Napolitano, S. A. (2009). *Bullying Prevention and Intervention: Realistic Strategies for Schools*. New York: Guilford.

138. Swearer, S., et al.,(2008). “You’re so gay!” Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, 37, 160-173.
139. Taylor, Jonte (2009) Rural Middle School Students' Perception of Bullying
140. Thunfors, P., & Cornell, D. (2008). The popularity of middle school bullies. *Journal of School Violence*, 7, 65-82.
141. Trach, J.,et al., (in press). Bystander responses to school bullying: A cross-sectional investigation of grade and sex differences. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*.
142. Unnever, J. D., & Cornell, D. G. (2003).Bullying, self-control, and ADHD. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 129-147.
143. Vaillancourt, T., et al. (in press). Places to avoid: Populational-based study of students’ reports of unsafe and high bullying areas at school. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*.
144. Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 157-176.
145. Vaillancourt, T., et al. (2008). Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavior*, 32, 486-495.
146. Van Cleave, J., & Davis, M. M. (2006). Bullying and peer victimization among children with special health care needs. *Pediatrics*, 118, 1,212-1,219.
147. Wang, Y. (2007) On the Cognitive Processes of Human Perception with Emotions, Motivations, and Attitudes
148. Warden, D., & Mackinnon, S. (2003). Prosocial children, bullies and victims: An investigation of their sociometric status, empathy and social problem-solving strategies. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 21, 367-385.
149. Whitney, I., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., & Sharp, S. (1994). The Sheffield Project: methodology and findings. In P. K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), *School bullying: insights and perspectives*. London: Routledge
150. Whitney, I., Smith, P. K., & Thompson, D. (1994).Bullying and children with special educational needs. In P. K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), *School Bullying: Insights and Perspectives* (pp. 213-240). London: Routledge.
151. Woods, S. & Wolke, D. (2004).Direct and relational bullying among primary school children and academic achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42, 135-155.