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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of research, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, research hypotheses, the theoretical framework of the research, the conceptual framework, the scope of the study, definition of terms and significance of the study.

Background of the Study

Education and research has progressed tremendously and the benefactors of this new development are the children in the schooling system. This is an ideal time for children to explore and develop their potential for learning, a time when dreams and a vision for the future are gently built through inquisitive and keen minds. The school is a place for children to learn, create friendships that encompass trust and compassion and develop their personalities with guidance from teachers and support from families. Schools, without a doubt must be a safe and secure place for all children. However, behind school walls there is a dark cloud hovering this sanctuary of learning all around the world. An issue that has been taken lightly for an unreasonably long time, bullies.

A comparative study of the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders can lead to an understanding of what can be done collectively to tackle this lingering problem that seems to increase when ignored. In order for any school to select an intervention or prevention program, the school needs to have a clear picture on what
are the attitudes and perception with regards to the three main groups that contribute to a school community. Stakeholders include school personnel, students, and parents. School personnel spend a lot of time with children and if there needs to be an intervention or awareness program, school personnel need to be trained and involved in the process. If there is no understanding of how they respond or even empathize with the situation, there is no way any strategy would work. Without an understanding of what school personnel or students perceive to be bullying and how they rate the severity of it, schools may be missing the mark and preaching things that are not necessary at all. If bullying starts with children, then it only makes sense that we get into the minds of our students and take a look at the situation from their point of view. Children may not be equipped to handle the situation on their own, but school personnel and parents can provide that support. There should be no bullies and the right awareness or intervention program can make sure that we get straight to the problem instead of flying over it aimlessly.

Bullying should never be dismissed as a typical and natural phenomenon in schools. This study aimed to gather results which would then assist the researcher in designing or selecting a bullying prevention program that is practical and can be used effectively in a primary school setting. Before choosing the right prevention program the researcher needed to identify the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders in the primary school setting.

Every child has the right to safety and security, schools have to do whatever it takes to ensure the safety and well being of every child. Every time there is a news on mass shooting at schools or universities, it is always linked to a student that was once bullied or a loner. For the boys who were victims of bullying the predominant forms of bully attack were more physical.
They would be hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, etc. On the other end of the spectrum, girls indulge in bullying behavior in less obvious ways. Their attack would be more verbal and psychological. This would include making nasty remarks or spreading gossip and rumors (Pengpid & Peltzer, 2013). The question is, how come nobody noticed? It is impossible for school personnel to miss what is going on or perhaps it is just the attitudes towards bullying that made them ignorant to such scenarios. School personnel and parents need to keep their eyes open. It is a fast changing world where technology is threatening human interaction. It is time that bullying is seriously addressed. Bullying is not a part of growing up and it is not how children should learn. It is clear that not every program and policy is fit for every school. Schools have to take the right action and work on implementing a program that fits their size and their students’ needs.

**Statement of the Problem**

Bullying is a normal part of growing up and the victims should just toughen up is a common stereotypical view and a big misconception. To ignore repeated behavior patterns that cause a sense of insecurity in children can have serious consequences for both victims and bullies (Hjert, 2008).

There are many arguments that suggest the idea that being picked on makes a child stronger and able to deal with the real world. Perhaps, the arguments stem from the misunderstanding between ‘conflict’ and ‘bullying’. Coloroso (2013) believed that programs that teach children to care deeply, share generously and help willingly are important. She emphasized that many people misunderstand the terms conflict and bullying. Conflict is when there is a disagreement, but bullying is someone who is actively lacking in compassion towards
another individual and seeks to exert power over someone that they feel is weaker than them. By repeating this behavior, they are communicating a lack of respect and compassion, a total disregard to the other person, the victim.

The problem is that children do not have enough understanding on the issues of bullying, therefore they do not have the necessary skills and knowledge on how to cope with the issue. This is prevalent in both scenarios. One in which they are are bullies and the other in which they are the victims. Improving parent-child communication and parental involvement with their children could have a substantial impact on child bullying (Shetgiri, 2012). Parents are a child’s first teacher and children imitate what they see. The researcher believes that school personnel have enough understanding and knowledge but may not reach their goals of creating a bullying free zone without the help of parents. The objective of this research is to study the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. This is probably the most important step for the school before it designs or selects an appropriate prevention and awareness program that school personnel and parents can work together in order to nurture the child's character together as a team.
Research Questions

Below are the research questions that was addressed in the study. The questions focused on the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

1. What are the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand?

2. What are the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand?

3. Are there any significant differences of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand?

4. Are there any significant differences of perception towards handling bullying among school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand?

Research Objectives

The objectives are listed below:

1. To identify the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

2. To identify the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.
3. To determine if there is a significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

4. To determine if there is a significant difference of perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

**Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses was formulated:

1. There is a significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand at the level of .05.

2. There is a significant difference of perception towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand at the level of .05.
Theoretical Framework

In this study, two major theories formed the theoretical basis for the framework of the study. The first one is The Social-Ecological Systems Theory and the second one is the Theory of Coping.

Social-Ecological Systems Theory

Previous studies by Yoon and Kerber used the Social Ecological Systems Theory as a basis for their research which used the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified as the main instrument for the study. Bullying cannot be explained in isolation without referring to the environmental influences which stem from the home, social system like schools and the peer. They are inter-related and the way the bullying manifests itself is through the acceptance and modeled behavior within the inter-related systems. The Social Ecological Systems Theory by Bronfenbrenner (1979) places the individual or in the case of this study, the student at the center of the model. According to the model, each level is nested within the other levels. This theory suggests that the levels of interaction among each relationship influences the attitude of the individual. The social-ecological system helps clarify why students act a certain way. What school personnel or parents perceive to be bullying behavior, directly influences the attitude of the primary student in that environment. The teacher-student and parent-student interactions is what creates the child’s attitude of the behavior and indicates whether the situation is bullying, its perceived seriousness and their empathy towards the victims. This interaction creates a social environment in which students learn how to develop their behaviour, manifests itself a part of the process of learning and the way they interact with other children. It is significant to the
behaviour of the child when they see how their teacher and parents respond to situations and climate of the school and home.

**Theory of Coping**

The theory of coping by Hunter and Boyle (2004) could be conceptualized that witnessing an uncomfortable situation such as a bullying incident for any of the members from the three groups of this study could trigger a sense of stress. Lazarus (1999) defined coping as a way that individuals manage life conditions that bring about stress. In order to form a response to that stressful situation, the theory suggests that two factors, the individual and situational factor affect the appraisal process. In this study, perception towards handling bullying refers to the response of the stressful situation, bullying. The appraisal process takes place by which one evaluates the situation that they are in and then selects the best action to resolve or respond to. The theory goes on to elaborate on the appraisal process as consisting of the primary and secondary aspect to it. The primary appraisal as in this study will give importance of a label to the event. In this case pertaining to the study the primary appraisal will ask “Is this bullying?” or “Is this serious?”. The secondary appraisal will be in terms of the evaluation of the responses that are available. According to the Handling Bullying Questionnaire the five responses to handling bullying include 1) working with the bully 2) working with the victim 3) enlisting other adults 4) disciplining the bully and 5) ignoring the incident.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework below is based on the theoretical framework which stems from the social-ecological perspective in terms of attitudes and the theory of coping which gives an understanding to perceptions towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi. The attitudes focused on perceived seriousness of the situation, empathy with the victim, and whether they identify the scenario as a bullying incident. The second aspect of the research identified perception that stakeholders have towards handling bullying. The responses include working with bullies, working with victims, enlisting other adults, disciplining the bully, and ignoring the incident.

**Independent Variables**
- School Personnel
- Students
- Parents

**Dependent Variables**
- Perceived Seriousness
- Empathy with the Victim
- Is this bullying?

- Working with bullies
- Working with victims
- Enlisting other adults
- Disciplining the bully
- Ignoring the incident

*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework*
Scope of the Study

The scope of this study focused on comparing the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders. The research was conducted at the International School of Chonburi in Chonburi, Thailand in 2017, as the school has an international curriculum and the stakeholders are able to understand English. There were regular communication, meetings, workshops and interaction with parents in the school community, which indicated support from the parent community and a willingness to assist the school in matters that will help their children.

This study identified the attitudes of stakeholders in three different aspects. Through six vignettes that presented different bullying scenarios, respondents responded to three questions on each of the vignettes. The questions measured the respondents attitudes on (a) perceived seriousness of the situation (b) whether or not they think it is bullying and (c) empathy towards the victim.

This study also identified the perception of stakeholders towards handling bullying behaviour based on five different strategies. The responses included (a) working with the bully (b) working with the victim (c) enlisting the help of other adults (d) disciplining the bully and (e) ignoring the incident.

One of the limitations of the study is the small size of the population of this study. This study cannot be generalized with all schools in Thailand. Another limitation was that since the study is conducted in an international school, it cannot be applied to other Thai schools because the philosophy of the school is very unique and different to the cultural context in Thailand.
Lastly, because bullying is a sensitive topic, it could be possible that the respondents showed answers that were socially desirable.

**Definitions of Terms**

In this study, certain terms that the researcher used are discussed:

*Attitudes*- refers to the way a person acts or reacts to people, objects, and a specific situation learned and organized through experiences.

In this study using the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire measured the seriousness, empathy towards victims and an identification whether or not this is a bullying scenario.

a. *Perceived seriousness*- refers to how serious the respondents see the situation according to the vignettes presented. Questions measured seriousness of bullying from the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire were questions 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, and 6a.

b. *Is this bullying?*- refers to whether or not the respondents consider the situation to be labeled bullying. Questions that determined whether or not the respondents think of this situation as bullying was measured in question 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, and 6b.

c. *Empathy*- refers to how the respondents relate to the pain felt by the victim or their ability to share in another’s emotions, thoughts or feelings in the vignettes. Questions that measured the empathy of respondents towards the victims were questions 1c, 2c, 3c, 4c, 5c, and 6c.

*Bully*-refers to any person who habitually inflicts harmful acts to others.
**Bullying** - is when a student is repeatedly exposed to negative actions by one or more students. A form of physical, verbal and social aggression which is repeated over time within the context of an imbalance of power.

**Perception** - the process in which organisms interpret and organize sensation to produce a meaningful experience of the world. In this study the perception was measured using the Handling Bullying Questionnaire which measured how stakeholders' perceived towards handling bullying. There were five different responses in to handling bullying according to the Handling Bullying Questionnaire.

a. **Working with the bully** – refers to strategies on handling bullying that has to do with direct work or intervention with the bully. The first response, working with the bully was measured from questions 5, 9, 12, 19 and 21.

b. **Working with the victim** – refers to strategies on handling bullying that has to do with direct work or intervention with the victim. The second response, working with victims was measured from questions 6, 11, 17 and 22.

c. **Enlisting help from other adults** – refers to strategies that require help from another adult to help ease the situation. The third response, enlisting help from other adults was measured from questions 4, 13, 14, 15 and 20.

d. **Disciplining the bully** – refers to strategies that require consequences that serve to show the seriousness of the situation to the bully. The fourth response, disciplining the bully was measured from questions 1, 3 and 7.
e. *Ignoring the incident*- refers to not doing anything about the situation and simply ignoring it altogether. Finally, the fifth response, ignoring the incident was measured from questions 2, 8, 10, 16 and 18.

*Stakeholders*- those that have a direct impact from the decisions. In this study, the stakeholders include school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

a. *School personnel*- school administrators, teachers and teaching assistants at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand

b. *Students*- children aged 5 – 11 studying from Years 1 to 6 at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

c. *Parents*- caretakers of the students studying at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

**Significance of the Study**

This study aimed to identify the differences in attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. The researcher would be able to create a customized bullying prevention and intervention program that would work in a small primary school where resources are limited. The researcher intended to use this information to develop a unique workshop and training program for stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi. School personnel can educate parents and student and eventually it will serve as a ripple effect to creating a safe, positive and harmonious environment conducive to learning.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, which is a review of relevant literature will address the following areas of that will give a clearer understanding to the issues of bullying prevalent in society today.

• A Social-Ecological Perspective
• Theory of coping
• The Social Cognitive Theory
• Facts on bullying
• Myths regarding bullying
• A glimpse into the characteristics of Bullies
• A glimpse into the characteristics of Victims
• Long-term and Short-term effects of bullying
• Previous studies on attitudes and perception towards bullying
• A review of several different Bullying Prevention Programs
• Background of the school

A Social-Ecological Perspective

Urie Bronfenbrenner’s (1977, 1979) Ecological Systems Theory is built upon the assumption that a child or a student is at the center of their social environment. This theory suggests that the student is at the central of an interlocking social system which consists of their peers, family, school environment, community and culture. These social systems include people that influence the children in settings which the child is an active member of, such as home,
school or any other surrounding that has an indirect impact on that child, such as a parent’s workplace.

Bullying often impacts and has an effect on more than the students involved in a particular situation. There are indications of connections between teachers, students and parents involved in such circumstances and it is often questioned what is said and done to encourage or discourage such behavior in schools. One might investigate the history and circumstances that leads to an individual’s aggression and contemplate how they are stuck in such a dire situation. Craig and Pepler (1997) stated, bullying is a complex phenomenon and cannot be fully explained just by looking at two personalities involved, it is always studied within influences linked by interaction of school social system and peer group.

When examining bullying through a social-ecological perspective, one gets a clearer view and is able to understand this complex occurrence as a whole, rather than just an isolated incident. The complex nature of our personalities are shaped through a variety of situations that we go through from childhood. This theory gives clarity to the ‘why’ and ‘how come’ that run through our minds when addressing bullying. Bronfenbrenner’s (1977, 1979) Ecological Systems Theory suggests that the student is the core of all social systems that are interconnected and impacts the student in both direct and indirect ways. Research on the Ecological Systems Theory does not suggest that a child is ‘blank slate’ or how we often use the metaphor of a clean white sheet on which the environment makes its mark. Instead, Bronfenbrenner works on the assumption that there is a direct reciprocal influence between an individual and their environment. He also implied quite clearly that the environment is more than just the obvious surroundings, but also includes connections that stem from a broader settings. Bronfenbrenner
(1979) shared his views that the ecological environment can be compared to concentric circles, each contained within the other.

**Microsystem**

The most common setting for a microsystem includes school, home and peer group locations. Within the microsystem, an individual has an active role in their interaction with others. The influence comes from the child’s perceptions or how he interprets activities, roles and interpersonal relations (Brofenbrenner, 1979; Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992; Thomas 1996).

At the microsystem level, a researcher is able to make a prediction on a child’s behavior by observing their interaction with people and situations (Bronfenbrenner, 1993). Bronfenbrenner used the word “microsystems” because it meant the smallest unit. Microsystem is an indication of the most immediate relation that is important to the child. This includes the activity, the role and interpersonal relationships within the field. If there was a change in one of the aspects of the microsystem, it would be a completely new definition for the child (Thomas, 1996).

**Mesosystem**

Mesosystem is when two aspects of the Microsystem is combined. The events or people that stem from the Microsystem could interact to create a new reality for the student. Like Microsystems, Mesosystems could be long-term and recurrent like family get-togethers during the festive seasons. They could also imply a solitary or one-time occurrence, for example a school residential trip. Mesosystems are crucial to a child’s development and could pose as a complication in their lives. Mesosystems come from a link that connects two different settings in
a child’s life that would most otherwise be unrelated. Mesosystem identifies relation of family experiences to peers, or family to school, etc. An example in this situation is a child who is controlled too strictly by his parents may have difficulty making his own decisions in school. Or it could be that in some cultures children are taught to listen quietly to adults and never question an instruction, may have some adjustments to do in a school where questioning and thinking is encouraged by their teacher in the classrooms. The child has to adjust to differing mindsets everyday of their life and learns where and when his actions are acceptable. In the Mesosystem, the child has to play two roles at once, for example at a three way parent teacher conference in which the child has to raise questions to his teachers in front of his conservative parents. The mesosystem is less visible and obvious than the core of the theory, the microsystem (Thomas, 1996). Mesosystems are a double-edged sword, it can cause a negative reaction for a child as well as providing a positive aspect of growth. It is very important for people who deal with children to realize how Mesosystems can be created so that opportunities for support can work to a child’s advantage whilst reducing the stress triggers.

Exosystem

Ecosystem is yet another system within the Ecological System Theory’s concentric circles, which is defined as “one or more settings that do not involve the developing person as an active participant, but in which events occur that affect, or are affected by, what happens in the setting containing the developing person” (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p.25) For example, a parent may be stressed out from their work pressures and have little time to spend talking to his children. This experience which belongs to the parents impacts the children. The children may be
subject to negative behavior from their parents because their parents are anxious, nervous or bothered by a stressor from the workplace.

**Macrosystem**

The last circle in the outermost rim is the macrosystem. The Macrosystem includes the influence on a bigger level, for example their country or their culture. Children are not limited to their microsystems such as school and home. Homes and schools are a part of a community within countries. It is imbedded with ideologies and belief systems that would impact our experiences in life. For example, if majority of members in the community believe that aggressive behavior in boys is normal, than there may be many cases of unchecked violence and bullying in that community.

Trying to understand the interaction between and individual and their surrounding is not a simple task. Due to the challenges and difficulty, most researchers do not try to handle multiple microsystems at once. When researchers do not look at multiple microsystems they cannot understand the roles that nature and nurture plays (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). Although, it might be a little difficult to put this theory into practical experiments, there is a lot that can be benefited by looking at the different systems and how they affect the center of it all, the child (Swearer & Doll, 2001).

Within the ecological perspective, this research will focus on the interaction between the student and context of school personnel, students and parents at the school. The theory suggests that children look upon their social interactions from parents, teachers and peer group and that is how attitude and behavior is formed. For this study, it is essential that all three groups which
are stakeholders of the school share a similar perspective on their attitude towards bullying in order for any prevention or intervention program to work.

**Theory of Coping**

The transactional theory of coping (Hunter & Boyle, 2004). It could be conceptualized that witnessing an uncomfortable situation such as bullying incident for any of the members from the three groups of this study could trigger a sense of stress. Lazarus (1999) defines coping as a way that individuals manage life conditions that bring about stress. In order to form a response to that stressful situation, the theory suggests that two factors, the individual and situational factor affect the appraisal process. The appraisal process takes place by which one evaluates the situation that they are in and then selects the best action to resolve or respond to. The theory goes on to elaborate on the appraisal process as consisting of the primary and secondary aspect to it. The primary appraisal as in this study will give importance of a label to the event. The secondary appraisal will be in terms of the evaluation of the responses that are available.

Coping is viewed as having two different functions. The first function is the problem-focused function and the other is the emotion-focused function. These two functions serve to deviate the stress caused upon the individual. When an individual sees that a situation is serious, they have labeled its severity internally. The next process that follows is how they will fix the situation. It is likely that once they have appraised the situation that they are in, they will try to fix the problem by doing something to remedy themselves or the environment of the trouble in order to get them out of that stress. The second function is the emotion-focused
function. This function deals with strategies that is designed to reduce the pain from the stressful situation. It is as if, the situation is out of the individual's control so instead of trying to find a solution to the problem in the first place, they find a way to manage their feelings towards a situation. They could make excuses for bullying behavior and not confront the situation, but try to avoid the pain by ignoring the incident or avoiding situations that will put them in such positions.

In a typical bullying situation, the victim usually feels helpless and embarrassed with their situation. They would talk to a couple of close friends, or try some other method to relieve their anxiety about being bullied. Once they have coped with their feelings, the next step would be to turn to problem-focused coping. This is where it is essential for parents and school personnel to be on the same page in terms of attitudes towards bullying and their perception towards handling bullying in order to equip the students with this life skill and address the bullying right where it needs to. By shifting towards being problem-focused, the child would then look at bullying as a social issue that can be fixed and not internalize or externalize their problems. This would increase their self-confidence and enable them to deal with a negative social issue in a practical and proactive manner.

**Social Cognitive Theory**

The Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1989) is based upon a person’s cognitive schema (which translates to their past experiences), perception of self (which relies on self-efficacy) and environmental factors (Martins & Wilson, 2012). This theory is very close to the Social-Ecological model in the sense that children imitate what they see around them. The
study is done to compare the attitudes and perception of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, because the basis of this study is built upon the fact that children are around these school personnel and parents. How these adults display their attitudes towards bullying and their perception towards handling bullying will be reflected in the students and their interactions in such bullying situations. In a bullying scenario, which has the basis of aggressive behavior, Bandura (1989) states that the attitudes of the school personnel, parents and even other students, all of which are stakeholders serves as a reinforcement or reward for particular behaviours. For example, when there is an incident and a school adult does not interfere in the incident, the child learns that the behavior is acceptable and therefore imitates it. Another example is when parents are in a conflict of their own and the method that they use to resolve that conflict will then serve as a foundation the children to deal with their own conflict. If the parent uses aggression and loses control while dealing with their problems, it is very likely that the child watching his parent do that will eventually be doing the same thing.

Bandura’s social cognitive theory suggests that children copy the actions and behaviors that is modeled to them, be it at home, at school or within their close-knit social groups that they interact with causing it to influence the child’s cognitive schema and usually lasts a lifetime (Bandura, 1989)

Facts on Bullying

In order to design an appropriate bullying prevention program, it is necessary to understand the definition of bullying. According to Olweus (1993b) “A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the
part of one or more students” (p. 9). The bully has one objective and that is to exert power and intimidate other people into submission. The three categories of bullying include using physical force, verbal intimidation and psychological threats (Cohn and Canter, 2003; Koki, 1999; National Resource Center for Safe Schools, 1999; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001).

There are many areas of Olweus's definition that require additional or more detailed explanation. To begin with, “negative actions” when elaborated on, has to do with a clear intention to hurt or humiliate, both emotionally and physically. Bullying could be physical or verbal attacks and sometimes it could be a combination of both forms of attacks. Moreover, it is possible that a bully begins with a verbal torment and then uses the victims' angry response as an excuse to attack physically. When two people who are usually of the same size in terms of physical or psychological strength engage in taunting, teasing and fighting it does not constitute to bullying. Bullies generally use tactics that cause distress and pain against those who can't defend themselves because of their size or simply because the victim will not fight back (Olweus, 1993).

Bullying is different from other forms of aggression in a variety of ways. It involves a repeated pattern of abuse over a period of time, rather than in isolated events. We refer to those one time incidents as conflict and not bullying. It does not necessarily take place one on one; it may be carried out by a group against a single individual. When a group harasses one individual it is called “mobbing” according to Pikas (1989a).

Olweus (1993b) distinguished between direct and indirect bullying. The two types of bullying which is direct and indirect bullying is very true to its meaning. In direct bullying, it is
very obvious what the action of the bully is trying to achieve, it usually surfaces in a physical or verbal attack. Indirect bullying is more subtle, it includes manipulation and using tactics of isolation and exclusion to hurt their victims.

Unfortunately, bullying has escalated to become a common form of violence in our everyday life. Studies have shown that thirty percent of students between grades 6-10 have been involved in bullying, as perpetrator, victim, or sometimes both (Bowman, 2001; Cohn and Canter, 2003; Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, 2003; Harriss and Willoughby, 2003; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001). From the alarming number of 30% percent of students that have been involved in bullying, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NIHCD) report that 13 percent are bullies, 11 percent report being a victim, and 6 percent say they are have been on both sides of the spectrum (Cohn and Canter, 2003). Eight percent of students say they are victimized at least once a week (Harriss and Willoughby, 2003).

Studies have shown that bullying behavior increases as a child goes through elementary school grade levels but reaches its highest point in middle-school and declines in the students' final years in high school (Olweus, 1993). Surprisingly, most bullying takes the shape of verbal abuse and harassment. The next most prominent form of bullying is through social exclusion and making negative comments on the other’s appearance (Shellard, 2002). At the primary school level, bullying is usually done in the form of a physical attack or teasing, even social exclusion at times (Banks, 1997). Bullies are very careful about where their bullying behavior takes place, they will find a spot with less adults and be very covert in their actions. This does not mean that bullying does not take place in classrooms (Shellard, 2002).
In terms of gender, research shows that boys and girls are not immune to bullying. Although according to Cohn and Canter (2003) it is more likely that boys will end up as both bullies and victims. The *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2004* report found no significant difference in the percent of males and females that reported being bullied (8 percent of males versus 7 percent of females) (DeVoe et al., 2004). According to research, there is almost no difference when it comes to bullying either as a race or ethnicity.

In summary, bullying is an undesirable, aggressive behavior that is seen commonly in school aged children which usually involves a power imbalance, either real or as one perceives. Bullying is typically repeated or has the potential of being resurfacing, time and again. It is not uncommon for both parties involved to have serious, long-lasting problems. This study has taken three different types of bullying into account:

- **Verbal bullying** includes teasing, making inappropriate comments, jeering or taunting and threatening them verbally.
- **Social exclusion** is when the bully seeks to hurt someone's reputation or relationships that they may have. This includes exclusion, spreading rumors or plain public humiliation.
- **Physical bullying** is when the bully hurts a person physically or causes harm to their belongings. This includes any form of physical violence, spitting, tripping, taking their belongings or using inappropriate hand gestures.
Myths Regarding Bullying

In order to eradicate or effectively prevent bullying in schools, teachers and parents need to be fully aware of what particular characteristics makes a person a bully and who are their victims. According to Olweus, it has been identified that the generalized view on bullying is incorrect and inaccurate. Consequently, the tactics and methods designed to deal with bullying is therefore useless. Adult intervention is imperative in resolving a bullying issue that has taken place. According to Starr (2000) the first myth is that bullies make themselves feel important by picking on others. Bullies are insecure and have low self-esteem. Research indicates that bullies are aggressive by nature, they do not know how to empathize with other people. Although they have received poor parenting, they generally have high or above average self-esteem. The second myth is that bullies like the attention, all we have to do is ignore them. Contrary to that, research suggests that the nature of bullies seeks to control people and situations. If adults do not intervene, bullying behavior increases.

Another misconception is that there are many culture that account aggressive behavior as boys' play and that's how they will learn. The truth according to many studies is that bullying is not something that you grow out of, the aggression is redirected.

Some people simply believe that children have no tolerance for diversity. The fact of the matter is that victims are chosen because they look like they will not fight back or retaliate.

Many parents have the perception that victims need to stand-up and defend themselves. Studies indicate that victims are chosen because of their size and their nature which is more docile and weak.
Previously bullying was believed to only exist in large schools or classrooms. However, research shows that there is no relationship between the two. In fact, in a larger setting children have a better opportunity to find friends that are supportive.

Another popular belief is that bullying happens outside of school and if there is a case of bullying in schools, teachers will know. Research has shown otherwise, some bullying situations take place outside of school, but it is mostly taken places in discreet areas of the school. Also these discreet areas make it unlikely for the teachers to witness the incident. Often times, victims are too embarrassed or afraid to report such incidences.

It is not true that bullying affects only a few students. According to the National Association of School Psychologists (2001) there are 160,000 children that are afraid of going to school because of bullying.

**Characteristics of Bullies**

Frequently bullies are involved in teasing or intimidation especially towards those children that are weaker than them. It is their personal belief that they are superior and can assert power and control over those individuals that are perceived as weaker than them. One of the main goals bullies have is to insert dominance over those that they perceive they can control.

Many studies and research have been conducted in order to develop theories that could pinpoint or highlight likely causes of bullying behavior. In order to determine the precise cause, one cannot ignore Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory which gives a direction that bullying could be the outcome of complicated social-emotional factors not just a single
situation or event. The cause of aggressive behavior which could lead to bullying could be further linked to some criminological theories.

**Low Self-Control**

Based on the studies of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), Moon & al. (2008, p.5) have suggested that bullying is linked with criminal behavior. The study highlights bullying to fall into the same category as many other kinds of social crime. It is undeniable that bullying directly impacts a student’s sense of safety in school and that it eventually threatens how well students perform in their academics. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) very clearly indicated in their studies that low self-control is the key to criminal behavior. They have indicated that “low self control is the main source of criminal behavior and behavior analogous to crime, in which individuals with low self-control are more likely to seek immediate gratification, to be physically active, to be insensitive to others, and to possess limited academic ability” (p.88).

Following that presumption on self control, they believe that individuals with low-self control will more likely than others become associated with criminal, rowdy and destructive behavior than those people that have higher levels of self-control. They also clearly stated that it is not a only a matter of self-control that is enough to lead to an individual turning into a criminal (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990).

The theory suggests that parents need to step up and take action upon seeing low-self control type behavior in their children. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue that “the effective parental practices like monitoring, recognition of deviant behaviors, and punishment of deviant behavior, have significant effects of the development of self control” (p.90). Parenting practices
are hypothesized to have a significant effect on children’s self control, which in turn affects
deviant and criminal behavior (Moon, et al., 2008). This could be a double edged sword in
which some parents’ authoritarian and violent behavior will make their children imitate such
behavior and could cause bullying behavior if parents maximize their role in the children’s life.

**Differential Association Theory**

In simple terms, this theory suggests that bullying behavior is a consequence that arises
from children being exposed to or are within delinquent environments. Many studies have
shown that if a child is in the presence or are friends with those that bully, they themselves will
turn into bullies. (Moon, et al. 2008). Rigby (2003) wrote: “students are powerfully influenced
by a smaller group of peers with whom they have relatively associated”. By associating with
friends who display antisocial or negative behaviors, children can easily learn the ways of
committing such inappropriate behavior, and as a result promote such negative and undesirable
behaviors (Moon, et al. 2008).

When a child is surrounded by delinquent behavior, it is very easy and natural for them to
fall into the same trap. According to social learning theory developed by Bandura (1977), O’
Connel (1999) three main aspects that increase the chances of imitation is when the role model is
strong and powerful, when their behavior has given them positive reinforcement and when they
share similar characteristics. As he studied, he became aware that with bullying, these aspects
were often present in the situation.

During their observation, Craig and Pepler, (1995) have found that the bullies almost never
faced the consequences of their action. “Only 11% of episodes were being intervened by peers and
4% by teachers. As a result, peers may be influenced by bullies to become active participants in bullying” (O’Connel, et al. 1999, p.438).

According to O’Connel, et al. (1999) bullies play a major role in influencing negative behavior in their peer group. First of all, bullies expose aggressive behavior when they are engaged in bullying and to make matters worse behavior seldom gets them into trouble. When there is no consequence for negative behavior, not only is it repeated it is also imitated. Those that see them as the being feared and powerful will want the same kind of attention for themselves. Observing a lack of sensitivity will eventually breed a lack of sensitivity among the others. This is what the Social-Ecological Model has suggested all along.

**General Strain Theory**

The General Strain Theory (GST), which was found by sociologist Richard Agnew (2001), a renowned researcher in the field of criminology. The general strain theory bases itself upon the fundamental assumption that stressful life events cause anger, frustration, sadness and negative emotions which can result in delinquent coping responses (Agnew, 2001). This implies that bullying becomes a coping tool when children are dealing with a situation that is a strain to them. When children act out by seeking revenge or trying to release their pain whilst being in a situation that they cannot handle and a combination of low-self control, this acts as a trigger that increases their chance of becoming a bully (Agnew, 2001). Tam and Taki (2007) stated that by acting upon these impulses which leads children to become bullies. In short, they are just trying to ease their pain and bullying becomes their defense mechanism in dealing with problems.
Bullying and the general strain theory has been studied together many times. Browne and Falshaw (1996) indicated that bullies were likely to have had some kind of physical or emotional pain as a child, after studying a sample of youth placed at a youth treatment center. There are also many suggestions that if a child has experienced physical punishment or abuse, rejection and a perception of unfair treatment (Olweus, 1993) that is a cause linked to bullying. Not only that, some studies (Bosworth et al., 1999; Espelage et al., 2000) indicated that anger is directly related to bullying. These findings showed consistency with the assumption of the general strain theory, which suggested that individuals who have suffered through either physical or emotion abuse, unjust treatment, rejection or anger have a significant likelihood to be involved in bullying.

Group Relation Theory

Victimization can occur to an individual or it could occur between one or more groups towards each other (Pikas, 1975). Bystanders can turn into bullies themselves, simply because they see that something is not right and are simply ignoring it (Salmivalli and Voeten, 2004). Even in the instance in which the bystander may feel bad for the victim, their actions of just looking makes them one of the group members that sides with the bully (Salmivalli and Voeten, 2004). In relation to this, Olweus, (1973) when it becomes a norm that stems from peer pressure, conformity becomes inevitable and a pattern (Berndt, 1979).

It is often seen the bullies show aggressive behavior towards peers and other adults. Many studies have found that bullies have very low empathy towards their victims and do not feel anxious or insecure about what they are doing. As mentioned earlier, bullies are known to
have unusually high or above average self-esteem and in some instances do well academically in school as well. Bullying behavior is usually developed in response to different factors whether it is from the school, home environment or even the group of friends.

Bullying is increased when there is no supervision from adults at home. Many studies also indicate the bullies often come from homes where there is physical punishment and instances in which children are encouraged to hit back as a means of handling their issues with their friends.

**Bullies and Their Families**

It is widely recognized that violence is a learned behavior as mentioned at a UNESCO Conference in Seville in 1986, the primary source of learning is the family and that the supportive parents is highly significant in the process of learning (Ryan, Martin, & Brooks-Gunn, 2006).

At home children are taught how to treat other people also how to value and respect others. It is essential to examine the relationships between bullies and family factors in order to comprehend where is the source of aggression and victimization coming from. Family dynamics can be summarized using two key attributes, responsiveness and demanding-ness. The first attribute, responsiveness, is how well parents are aware of their child's physical, personal-social and emotional needs. Are they supporting their child's growing autonomy or independence. The second attribute, expectation, is the extent to which parents demand mature behavior, supervise activities and discipline transgressions.
Study show the families of bullies often show very low responsiveness which reflects a lack of involvement from parents. In instances where emotion is displayed it is usually out of anger or typically driven by an attempt to exert power and control by the parents.

Characteristics of Victims

There has been no definitive research that supports a common held belief that children are victims because of their physical characteristics. It is identified that mostly victims are seen as unassertive, nervous, insecure and meek in their dealings with other children. Victims are perceived to be weak or easily intimidated and dominated (Shellard, 2002; Banks, 1997; Kreidler, 1996). Studies indicate that bullies tend to target those who appear physically or emotionally weaker than them. The profile of the victim is likely to be someone that would not retaliate when attacked. Researchers also indicated that victims usually come from families that are overprotective. The overprotective nature of parents usually results in children that are unable to develop coping skills for daily situations in life. Victims often long for their perpetrators to approve and befriend them. It is like, they are seeking an acceptance from the very people that are hurting them (Cohn and Canter, 2003).

It can be concluded that victims generally long for approval and many times would attempt to interact with their victimizer. It is often the case that victims are socially isolated and have few friends to support them. It is common for them to make excuses to stay away from school or hide during breaks because they do not want to deal with the social setting in which they could be intimidated. (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001; Olweus, 1993).
Victims and Their Families

The family dynamics of bullying victims are less clearly understood. In at least some cases they appear to be similar to those of bullies, especially in lack of consistent disciplinary practices, unrealistic developmental expectations, child parent relationship difficulties, marital problems and financial problems.

It must be noted that when a child is overly dependent on parental support that child can become socially ineffective, insecure, shy and disadvantaged around peers. It is unclear whether the closer relationship with parents precedes or follows victimization, or both. A child's need to experience closeness, security and emotional comfort in the home is likely to increase in direct proportion to suffering experienced at the hands of peers (Gilmartin, 1987; Olweus, 1992; Robins, 1966).

Effects of Bullying

Bullying can trouble almost everyone from those who are being bullied, those that bully and bystanders who witnessed bullying. There are many negative outcomes to bullying which includes effects on mental health, substance abuse and in the worst of situations suicide. It is vital for school teachers parents and children to have an open line of communication. There should be a regular assessment to determine whether or not there is a problem at school. Bullying has repercussions which include long-term effects on academic, physical and emotional well-being of all those who are involved. Bullying directly impacts the school’s learning climate and creates fear and intimidation, which then results in an unfavorable environment that is not conducive to learning (Shellard and Turner, 2004; Lumsden, 2002).
Some of the elements or consequences of children who are involved in bullying and the effects that it has on their lives. Children that are bullied will be more inclined towards anxiety and depression in the future. Moreover, there could also be an increasing amount of sadness and loneliness. There is also a change in their sleep and eating patterns. It is common that these victims would not be able to enjoy the things that they once did. These issues may very well persist into their teens or into adulthood. Children being bullied might have more health complaints. It is also more likely that children being bullied avoid participating in school events and are more likely to miss skip and eventually drop out of school therefore leading to decreased academic achievement. Studies have shown that a very small number of children who have been bullied will retaliate through extreme violent measures. The consequences of bullying can be long term and well into adulthood, which will include depression and other mental health issues (Shellard, 2002).

Some of the consequences that have been found include severe trauma and distress. It is also reported that students blame bullying as a reason why they have difficulties at school and about 10 percent of students eventually drop out of school because they have been bullied (Weinhold and Weinhold, 1998; Hoover and Oliver, 1996). On the other side of the spectrum it is important to examine the consequences that children who bully others face in their life. It is very likely that the children, either bullied or the bully eventually engages in more violent and other risky behaviors by the time they reach adulthood. There is a pattern for their behavior and it is likely the kids who are bully would get involved in alcohol and other forms of drug abuse as teenagers or young adults. When there is a pattern for their behavior, it is not surprising that they take on further inappropriate acts such as fighting, vandalism and dropping out of school.
There is also a likelihood to engage in early sexual activity. As adults they may face criminal convictions and traffic citations. The last effect listed in research is perhaps the start of a vicious cycle in which they are abusive towards their romantic partners, spouses or their children. Eron (1987) established that adults who have been childhood bullies tended to parent children who bullied others. These long-term consequences are largely echoed in longitudinal data from the Scandinavian countries (Olweus, 1993b). To sum it up, bullies face negative consequences just as their victims do. They are not well liked when they get to high school. They end up having very few friends, becoming antisocial and eventually become a part of some criminal activity. When looking at some criminal activity such as vandalism, dropping out of school or fighting for instance, there is almost always a connection to bullying.

The last participant in bullying is most often bystanders or children who witnessed bullying but are not directly involved in it. When faced with a situation that they feel helpless about, bystanders could turn to substance abuse or drugs. Bystanders are also subject to depression and anxiety. They may also skip or miss school to avoid the situation. Basically students who witness bullying on a regular basis suffer the insecurities of being in an unsafe environment, fearing that they may be targeted next. Bystanders sometimes feel betrayed by the system and perceive that teachers turn a blind eye or simply have no ability to correct a messed up situation (Shellard and Turner, 2004).

**Previous Studies on Bullying**

There have been many interesting studies regarding the attitudes and perception of bullying at many different levels. Many of those studies include parents, teachers, guidance
counsellors, school administrators and students. Bullying does not happen in isolation, it happens when perpetrators get away with it. Most studies emphasize on understanding the roles of parents, teachers and bystanders of bullying incidents in order to understand the vicious cycle and stop it in the right place. There have been researches earlier that measured teachers’ attitude towards physical, verbal and social exclusion (relational) bullying among elementary teachers (Yoon & Kerber, 2003). The participants consisted of 94 teachers who worked in elementary schools in Midwestern, United States of America (Yoon & Kerber, 2003).

The questions consisted of six vignettes of different types of bullying scenarios. The vignettes were a modified version of the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire (BAQ) (Yoon & Kerber, 2003). The participants rated each question by choosing from a 5 point Likert scale from not serious to very serious (Yoon & Kerber, 2003) and they also had to rate how much empathy they had for the victims, would they intervene in the situation and what kind of intervention they would choose.

It was reported that teachers though social exclusion was not a serious matter and had less empathy for those victims. Teachers found physical bullying to be serious and would intervene in those type of incidents. Only 10% of the participants subjected the bully to a punishment in terms of the type of bullying that excluded a peer socially. However, 50% of respondents chose to punish the bully if the incident was physical or verbal in nature (Yoon & Kerber, 2003).

Another study by Bauman and Del Rio (2006) used the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire. There were two groups of participants in this study. The first group of participants of the study were college students (n=82) who were enrolled in a teaching program and were students of
educational psychology. The second group were 36 professionals who were in the academic field and were from seven different countries. All participants of the second group had published an article, written a chapter or even published a book on school bullying within a 5 year span (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Bauman & Del Rio (2006) found similar results as Yoon and Kerber in their research. They also added two additional open-ended questions to the study, what they would do during the incident and a suggestion to addressing the situation and responding the the victim (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006).

They found significant difference in physical and verbal bullying. There was no significant difference between social exclusion and verbal bullying. Participants were reluctant to get involved with a child that was socially excluded, because they believed that the child lacked the right social skills. It was interesting to note that all participants actually thought that intervention was time consuming and by dealing with it, they would be taking away their instruction time (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Misha et al. (2005) also came to the same conclusion that teachers did not respond to non-physical forms of bullying, because they did not think it to be serious. They felt it was part of growing up and would not cause much distress to the victim (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006).

There has also been some research that showed a gap between the perception held by students and teachers towards handling bullying by teachers. Teachers responded that they intervened quite frequently, but students responded the complete opposite. In a study by Pepler, Craig, Zegler, and Charach (Bradshaw et al., 2007) 84% of teachers responded to intervening a bullying situation, whereas only 35% was reported by students. It is apparent that students believed that their teachers were ignoring the situation, whether or not it is intentional is not
clear. This lack of intervention just reinforces the perpetrator to do what they do and the victims are reluctant to inform anyone because they perceive the attitude of their parents and teachers to lack empathy towards the situation they are in.

**Bullying Prevention Programs**

Bullying is a real threat to students. Schools need to be a safe place for all children. Without safety, how are children expected to learn. This research will look at a few bullying prevention programs that are suitable in the primary school setting.

From the researcher’s point of view bullying prevention programs need to start when a child is still young, as it can escalate later as the child grows. As mentioned, bullying escalates with age in the elementary level, it is crucial that prevention and awareness is in place as early as possible (Tsiantis, et al., 2013). Children from kindergarten to 6th grade need prevention programs that can cater to their age of development. (Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011)

**The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program**

There was an unfortunate incident in 1983, in which three male students in Norway between the ages of 10-14 committed suicide as a result of bullying. These deaths were uncalled for and certainly a reflection of a critical problem that called for serious intervention in Norway to end bullying and aggression in its youth. Professor Dan Olweus, a psychologist was appointed by Norway’s Ministry of Education to do study the aspects of bullying and find an appropriate intervention strategy (The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: A Proven school
based program to reduce bullying, 2005). This resulted in the program, the First Bergen Project Against Bullying, known today as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Limber, 2011). The prevention program was the first of its kind that was designed with the whole school in mind and also provided a systematic means of evaluation (Smith, Schnieder, Smith, & Ananiadou, 2004). The program was designed to be used school-wide at all levels with an intention of eradication bullying behavior completely (Olweus, 1993). The program will serve all levels, primary and secondary (Limber, 2011).

The Olweus program places school adults as the most responsible individuals in dealing with and solving problems. The program involves all children, not only the ones that have a problem. The program is there for good, which means that it is not a temporary fix. The program is a part of the teaching and learning at school. The program works simultaneously on three levels:

- **School.** At the school level, there is a clear action plan for the implementation of the program. First of all, the faculty surveys students anonymously to get an understanding on the prevalence of bullying in schools. During breaks and recess there is adequate supervision to make sure that any incidents are reported and dealt with promptly. There are also school-wide assemblies to discuss bullying and dealing with them. Teachers are trained on how to carry out the program. There is a formally established coordinating committee to manage the program. Regularly set meetings take place to discuss bullying issues between parents and school staff.

- **Classroom.** Teachers play a vital role in the introduction and enforcing classroom rules against bullying. They talk about bullying regularly with children in their
classrooms and also schedule meet with parents to encourage their participation. It is important to note that there are immediate consequences for unacceptable or inappropriate behavior and positive reinforcement for inclusive behavior.

- Individual. School adults work with families and students through role-play activities and serious meetings and discussions.

Olweus (1993) reported a 50 percent reduction on bullying. A survey was carried out which showed a clear reduction in bullying and perceptions of school environment improved with children being more satisfied. Children were better behaved and there was a reduction in antisocial behavior as well (Olweus & Limber, 2010).

Over the years, they would consistently carry out the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire and results show that there is a 40 percent reduction in self-reported bully victimization and approximately 50 percent in self-reported bullying (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Overall, the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program has given us hope in terms of bullying prevention that is a school-wide program. If the program is implemented with a significant amount of research and on-going evaluation, it shows to decrease bullying behavior and victimization. Once again, schools must tread very carefully and not just assume that this program is suited to every school and all students. We must keep in mind that research, information and reflective implementation is vital in developing or customizing elements of the program so that it serves our needs in the best possible way.
Kisusaamista Vastaan (KiVa)

According to KiVa International’s website (www.kivaprogram.net), KiVa is an innovative school-based anti-bullying program which has been developed by using cutting-edge research on bullying and its mechanisms.

The tag line on their website very clearly states that 

*KiVa is not meant to be a one-year project, but a permanent part of the school’s anti-bullying work.*

KiVa stresses on the ideas of prevention, intervention and monitoring as the heart of their program. KiVa makes it very clear that although prevention of bullying is crucial, it is also imperative that bullying cases are tackled effectively. In their statements, they maintain that no prevention effort can permanently eradicate bullying once and for all however, schools need to equip themselves with necessary tools when a case of bullying becomes evident in a school’s environment. The third and final aspect of KiVa, which is monitoring is essential in understanding the changes that take place over time. They have also made these tools available online. The tools provide a yearly feedback for each school on how successful their implementation has been as well as the outcomes obtained.

Just as in the Olweus project, the KiVa curriculum (student lessons and online games) are aimed to serve all students of the school, they call this the Universal Action. The role of this Universal Action is to be used as a preventive measure and geared towards creating an understanding on bullying throughout the school. However, there are times when preventive measures cannot work in a situation that has already taken place. This is when they use Indicated Actions. Indicated Actions are to be used when a bullying case has come to light. They are specifically targeted to the children or students who have been involved in bullying as
perpetrators or victims. They are also targeted towards the bystander who are challenged whether or not or how they could support the victim. There is one clear objective here, to put an end on bullying.

In Finland KiVa has been evaluated in a large randomized controlled trial including 117 intervention schools and 117 control schools. KiVa has been able to show a significant reduction in both self and peer reported bullying and victimization (Karna, Voetan, Little, Poskiparta, Kaljonen & Salmivalli, 2011). It has been able to overcome all the different types of bullying that is prevalent in our society today, which also includes cyberbullying (Salmivalli, Karna, & Posikparta, 2011). When a bullying prevention program proves to be successful like KiVa, children report liking school and academic achievement is improved (Salmivalli, Garandeau & Veenstra, 2012). Happy children will report positive changes within the school and that shows that the learning climate is cheerful and pleasant (Williford, Noland, Little, Karna, & Salmivalli, 2012). 98% of victims involved in meetings and discussion with the schools’ KiVa teams felt that their situation is getting better and they feel more hopeful and are better equipped at dealing with their problems (Garandeau, Poskiparta, & Salmivalli, 2014). Finally, Finnish data from more than a thousand schools that used KiVa in the autumn term of 2009 indicated that the implementation, both victimization and bullying had reduced and the reduction was significant. Even though, there are many positive outcomes stated in KiVa’s anti bullying program, there is still much research to be done. The reason is because initially, the program has been employed in Finland, with most of the population being Caucasian and only 3% of the population are immigrants (Karna, et al., 2011b). With that limitation in mind, KiVa is now being studied in several countries; the first international studies from the Netherlands,
Estonia, Italy and Wales are making their way to the international sector, showing that Ki Va can be implemented in other countries as well. According to their web page, Ki Va won the European Crime Prevention Award in 2009, Social Policy Award for Best Article in 2012 and for National Awards in 2008, 2010, 2011 and 2012. It is very important for Ki Va to conduct more research in diverse settings such as international schools or in countries that have ethnic diversity, like the United States before it could promote a more global implementation.

**Walk away, Ignore it, Talk it out, and Seek help (WITS)**

WITS, an acronym for Walk away, Ignore it, Talk it out, and Seek help. It has been created in Canada and the target audience is for children in kindergarten up until the third grade (Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011). WITS was initiated as a result of the work among three main groups, the Rock Solid Foundation, the Greater Victoria School District 61 and developmental psychologists from Victoria’s Centre for Youth and Society. This initiation came in order to address violent incidents across North America (Leadbeater, 2008; Hoglund, Hosan, & Leadbeater, 2012). Using the WITS acronym makes it easy for children to remember and identify the steps according to how they should be dealing with the situation (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbetter, 2012). The aim of this program is to enhance a child’s positive social behavior, which will become a stepping stone to a reduction of hostile and aggressive tendencies which eventually leads to bully like behavior (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbetter, 2012). WITS connects the three pillars of a school together which is student, families and communities (Leadbeater & Hoglund, 2006; Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011). WITS brings about the help from
emergency providers, parents and the classroom as a key ingredient to its program (Leadbeater, 2008).

Teachers integrate WITS into their everyday curriculum, they will use specially designed books that focuses on bullying and therefore a seed of the WITS message is planted in every child (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbeater, 2012; Leadbetter & Sukhawathanakul, 2011). The curriculum develops a child’s social skills in addition to personal responsibility (Leadbeater & Hoglund, 2006). The WITS manual is equipped with a list of books, suggestions of lesson, activities and many more ideas that will incorporate the message that WITS stand for. There are guidelines and resources so that teachers are able to tackle bullying without feeling burdened or overwhelmed (Leadbeater, 2008). The only requirement is that at least one book from the list is read every month (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbeater, 2012; Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011).

WITS is unique in the sense that it involves community helpers such as police, firefighters and paramedics in its program (Leadbeater, 2008). These community helpers are invited at the start of each school year as an exemplary role model in a school wide assembly (Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011). They would have a swearing in ceremony in which thy vow to uphold responsible behavior towards their peers by becoming WITS Special Constable (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbeater, 2012). Their work involves coming into classrooms monthly to encourage children to practice WITS outside of school as well (Leadbeater, 2008).

Parents and guardians are also encouraged to be a part of the WITS program. They receive information leaflets on how to deal with conflict both at home and at school. This ensures that parents and guardians are on the same page of a preventive program that is used at
school (Leadbeater & Hoglund, 2006). The WITS program also has a “time out” aspect, which parents are encouraged to use at home as well (Leadbeater, 2008). When all components work together, there is no confusion for the child. Everything starts to make sense because the message is consistent. Children need consistency.

A five year study done by Leadbeater & Hoglund (2006) in 2000 consisted of 1st grade students from 17 urban schools and 41 classrooms. The intention of the study was to understand how effective the WITS program was. Baseline data was collected at the beginning of first grade and subsequent data was collected at the end of first, second, third and fifth grades (Leadbeater & Hoglund, 2006). They used the Social Experience Questionnaire in order to understand self-reported victimization in children and took data from Early School Behavior Rating Scale which included information provided by teachers (Leadbeater, Hoglund & Woods, 2003). Although Hoglund and Leadbeater found a clear reduction in peer victimization, they could not indicate precisely which component was the significant contributor. Therefore, Leadbeater and Sukhawathanakul (2011) conducted a quasi-experimental study and center the research around students from kindergarten to the third grade. Only schools that have implemented the WITS program one year prior to the evaluation was able to participate in the study. The study showed that a combination of factors contributed to the success of the program. A third study done by Hoglund, Hosan and Leadbeater (2012) tracked 432 students from grades one through three over a period of six years. This study indicated that even upon using the program for just once a month there was a clear reduction in peer victimization (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbeater, 2012). The researchers of WITS have also mentioned that
although WITS shows results it is not enough to stop peer victimization in the future (Hoglund, Hosan & Leadbeater, 2012).

**Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program**

Steps to Respect was designed in the United States of America aiming to reach out to children between grades three through six (Hirschstein, Van Schoiak Edstrom, Frey, Snell & MacKenzie, 2007). The program is based on three fundamental areas in order to reduce bullying in schools. The three fundamental areas include (1) an increase in staff awareness and observation of bullying behavior in schools, (2) emphasizing on social awareness and responsibility and (3) equip children with both social and emotional skills to stop bullying and create positive relationships (Frey, et al., 2005). The aim of the program is to change student perception on tolerance of bullies and to increase empathy towards victims and how they can help as a bystander (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011). This program advocates that changing students' attitudes and understanding is directly related to reducing bullying behavior in schools (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011).

Steps to Respect comes together with three major aspects, staff training, curriculum, and parental involvement (Frey, et al., 2005). Once schools have decided that they want to implement the program, the next step is to train their staff. Staff are trained in three to six hours on the goals and expectations of the program (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011; Frey, et al., 2005). Administrators, school counselors and teachers get two extra hours of training in order to create coping strategies for children that are dealing with being bullied or are bullies.
In terms of the classroom curriculum there are three distinct levels. Level 1 is for either grade 3 or 4, Level 2 is for grade 4 or 5 and Level 3 is for grade 5 or 6 (Frey, et al., 2005). The program consists of eleven activities or lessons (Frey, et al., 2005; Hirschstein, Van Schoiak, Frey, Snell & MacKenzie, 2007; Low, Frey & Brockman, 2010). Teachers are encouraged to use a variety of teaching strategies in order to appeal and create thorough understanding to all students (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011).

The last but perhaps most important key to the prevention program is based on parental involvement. School administration keeps parents in the loop about the Steps to Respect program. It is imperative that parents are aware of school policies, rules and procedures with regards to bullying (Frey, et al. 2005). Letters are sent out as a means to reinforce concepts learnt at school and to specify the exact nature of lessons that their children are participating in (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011).

There is very limited data on effectiveness of the Steps to Respect program. This is because research comes from the same data. According to the studies, there seems to be a decrease in bullying rates. The program had a positive impact on school climate, fewer incidents of physical bullying and fewer problem related to bullying being reported at school (Brown, Low, Smith & Haggerty, 2011). It is important for more research to be done on the reliability of the program.

Just as it is important to review good and effective programs that could help prevent a problem such as bullying, it is just essential to reflect on a school’s environment and setting in order to create the right fit. The issue is making sure the environment we provide for our
students enable them to reach their full potential. With problems such as bullying lurking in the school's hallways, it does not encourage children to learn. Rather it creates fear and resonates into serious problems if not discouraged right from the start. The researcher believes that there is considerable research in the western countries but much research is lacking in Asia where these problems are easily dismissed by parents and teachers as a natural part of the schooling culture and education. We cannot solve this problem if we do not get the whole community involved and ready to address the concern head on.

**Background of the School**

The International School of Chonburi is located in Chonburi, a city approximately 140 kilometers away from Bangkok. It is located on the outskirts of Pattaya and is in the prime area of the Eastern Seaboard of Thailand. There are quite a few industrial parks in the Eastern Seaboard area and therefore there are many international companies from different countries located within the region. The demographics of the city is extremely diverse with a huge expat community that lives in the region.

The International School of Chonburi (ISC) is a kindergarten and primary school that caters for children between the ages 2 to 11. It was started in 2009 as a kindergarten that was loosely based on the philosophy of Reggio Emilia. The school implements United Kingdom's Early Years Foundation Stage Curriculum for children ages 2 - 5. ISC also uses UK's National Curriculum for both Key Stage 1 and 2. The primary school system starts at Year 1 or when a child turns 5 before the start of the school year. Years 1 and 2 belong to Key Stage 1. Years 3 - 6 fall into the Key Stage 2 category.
The International School of Chonburi is dedicated and has a motto that says ‘every child matters’. This motto is the underlying statement that forms the vision and mission for the school. Every child is unique and different, within the differences every child has the potential to learn. The curriculum is delivered through different methods of differentiation and communication between home and school is the school’s strength. The school has parents that are extremely involved and supportive to the activities and learning experiences on a regular basis. The school has an open door policy for all parents, which means that parents are free to visit the school at any given time during school hours. They are encouraged to be partners with the school in terms of their child’s learning. Parents are vocal and because of this environment, the school has a diverse and international population that comes from almost 20 different countries. The entire school population is about 90 children and 45 being in the primary classrooms of Key Stage 1 and 2.

Currently, there have been no reported issues on bullying from school personnel and primary students. Since the school has been increasing one year level every year from 2009, it is a growing school. All growth comes with a learning experience. As children grow up, the school deals with novel issues that happen within the boundaries. For example, there is an increase in aggression on the playground when children are playing football. If not supervised and intervene, the behavior will continue. The strength of the school is that there are eyes and ears everywhere around the school. Incidents are reported in a timely and quick manner. There are assemblies and topics that deal with personal, social, emotional health issues as described in the curriculum. In assemblies, which is school-wide, school personnel deal with ongoing issues that are visible in the playgrounds and classrooms through an interesting session with all the
children. In the classroom, matters are dealt with right away and communication between school staff is especially important. Every teacher meets up regularly to share their observations on behavior that could escalate into an issue.

The intention of conducting this study was to streamline actions among stakeholders of the school community in order to enable the school to stand strong and continue to be a bully free school.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methods and procedures that will be used by the researcher while conducting this survey. It includes research design, respondents of the study, instruments used, collection of data and statistical techniques that was used in the analysis of the data.

Research Design

The design for this research was a quantitative comparative study of the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

Population

The population in this study were stakeholders which included all school personnel, students and parents of children between the ages of 5-11 years old at the International School of Chonburi from the academic year 2016-2017. This population included 22 school personnel, 37 students and 37 parents that were asked to take part in the survey from the International School of Chonburi. Parents could be either the mother or father of the child. All school personnel and parents at the International School of Chonburi were able to read and communicate in English. The primary students were able to communicate and understand English. The total number of population for the study was 96.
Table 1. Number of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Y1 - Y6)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Instrument

This study used two research instruments, the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified (BAQ-M) and the Handling Bullying Questionnaire. The Bullying Attitude Questionnaire (BAQ) was originally designed by Craig, Henderson and Murphy (2000) to assess teacher attitudes and used eighteen vignettes. However, for this study, the researcher will be using The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire-Modified (BAQ-M) which was modified by Yoon and Kerber (2003) in order to assess attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders. There have been some changes made to the original vignettes to make the bullying scenarios less vague and more clear (Yoon, 2004) using only witnessed bullying situations (Boulton et al., 2014).

The modified questionnaire assessed 3 aspects of attitudes towards bullying. The aspects were classified as (1) perceived seriousness of bullying, (2) whether or not they identify the situation as bullying, and (3) empathy toward victims. Each aspect of the attitudes towards bullying measured 3 forms of bullying. Respondents were presented with six vignettes. Six vignettes included two physical bullying, two verbal bullying and two social exclusion bullying
Physical bullying is when the bully hurts a person physically or causes harm to their belongings. This included any form of physical violence, spitting, tripping, taking their belongings or using inappropriate hand gestures. Verbal bullying included teasing, making inappropriate comments, jeering or taunting and threatening them verbally. Social exclusion refers to when the bully seeks to hurt someone’s reputation or relationships that they may have. This included exclusion, spreading rumors or plain public humiliation. Each vignette depicted bullying as a pattern of behavior, not as an isolated event.

Table 2. Type of Bullying Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Type of Bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the vignettes were three questions 1) How serious is the conflict? 2) Would you call this bullying? and 3) Do you empathize with the victim? For questions number (1) Perceived seriousness and (3) Empathy, the study used a 5 point Likert scale as a scale for measuring the attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders which are school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi. Question( 2) the response format is
dichotomous (items range from 0 – 1). For this question the responses were measured as a percentage determined from the frequency of the response, which is either 'yes' or 'no' from the respondents.

Table 3. Attitudes Aspect from the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Seriousness</th>
<th>Physical Bullying</th>
<th>Verbal Bullying</th>
<th>Social Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a, 4a</td>
<td>1a, 3a</td>
<td>5a, 6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this bullying?</td>
<td>2b, 4b</td>
<td>1b, 3b</td>
<td>5b, 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2c, 4c</td>
<td>1c, 4c</td>
<td>5c, 6c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Interpretation Criteria for Questions 1 and 3 from the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51 - 2.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50 - 5.00</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study also used The Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ) designed by Bauman, Rigby & Hoppa, (2008). The instrument designed for this research included instructions, a scenario of bullying, and a response to the situation.

The Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman et al., 200) is a 22 item questionnaire in which the participant indicated the likelihood that they would use the strategies when faced with a bullying situation. This section focuses on how stakeholders would respond to a specific situation. The table below shows the different components of the items in terms of category which are the dependent variables in the study.

Table 5. Components of Perception from Handling Bullying Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies in Handling Bullying</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with the bully</td>
<td>5, 9, 12, 19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the victim</td>
<td>6, 11, 17, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisting other adults</td>
<td>4, 13, 14, 15, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining the bully</td>
<td>1, 3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring the incident</td>
<td>2, 8, 10, 16, 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Interpretation Criteria for the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 1.80</td>
<td>I definitely would not</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.81 – 2.60</td>
<td>I would not</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.61 – 3.40</td>
<td>I’m unsure</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41 – 4.20</td>
<td>I would</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21 – 5.00</td>
<td>I definitely would</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher score indicated the likelihood towards implementing the strategy presented in the questionnaire towards handling bullying.

Validity and Reliability

The researcher used two questionnaires for this study. The first questionnaire, the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire was originally developed by Craig, Henderson and Murphy (2000) to assess teacher attitudes and used eighteen vignettes. However, for this study, the researcher used The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire-Modified (BAQ-M) which was modified by Yoon and Kerber (2003). This questionnaire has been used in many research papers around the world. The second focused on the perception towards handling bullying events by means of the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Rigby, 2002). Content validity is the extent to which the items on a test appropriately measure a concept. Goodwin and Goodwin (1996) and Patten (2003) suggest that content validity is more judgmental than empirical.
Table 7. Reliability for the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards Bullying</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Seriousness</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy towards victims</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Reliability for the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies in Handling Bullying</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with the bully</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the victim</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisting other adults</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining the bully</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring the incident</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection of Data

The researcher distributed both the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified and Handling Bullying Questionnaire to school personnel at the International School of Chonburi after receiving permission from the Academic Head in April 2017 and collected the information within a week. The questionnaires were distributed to school personnel on April 24th, 2017 and collected on April 28th, 2017. The return rate from school personnel was 100 percent.

The researcher distributed both the Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified and Handling Bullying Questionnaire to the parents via their child's communication folder. The
communication folder is a communication tool between school and home. Parents check their child's folders daily for news, assignments and special events at school. Prior to sending out the questionnaires in the children's communication folder, the academic head at the International School of Chonburi sent out an email to 37 parents that would be participating in the study and asking for their support. This was also followed up by a personal conversation with parents that came to pick their children up from school. The researcher worked at the school and therefore was able to personally communicate the idea of the research to parents who were interested in understanding more. There was also a letter that was attached to the questionnaire given out to all parents taking part in the survey to ask for their involvement in the research. The researcher distributed the questionnaires on April 24th, 2017 and received a 100% response by April 28th, which was within the week. During that time, there were two Thai parents that were unclear about the questions and they spoke to the researcher in person one of the days during the week. Since most parents came to pick up their child from school everyday, they could also get clarification on any items that they did not understand since the researcher worked at the International School of Chonburi and was there everyday. The response from the parents indicated that the questionnaire was easy to understand. Parents were interested in the study and were keen on being involved with the researcher and even asked that the results of the study be shared with them. Since the study compared the difference between the three groups, it was not significant to the study the gender of the parent. Therefore any parent, being the mother or father was acceptable in the study.

The third group in this study were the students. There were a total of 37 students from Years 1 to Year 6. The researcher administered the questionnaire from April 24th to May 3rd,
2017 to the students. As for the students in Years 1 and 2, the researcher administered the questionnaires by pulling them out of their classrooms for about 15 minutes in order to get their answers one-on-one. Since the researcher worked at the International School of Chonburi, all the students knew the researcher very well and had a good level of familiarity with the researcher. In the past, the researcher had also carried out one-on-one assessment with all primary children once a term, so administering the questionnaire was not be a problem because the students are very familiar with the researcher. It also gave the researcher a chance to clarify the questions to younger children, especially those in Years 1 and 2. The children in Years 3-6 were able to read fluently and the questionnaire was administered as a group, while the researcher was in the room. To assist these children the researcher also did a dramatization of the vignettes for the children using puppets. This made it easier for them to read and connect the scenarios that were presented to them. Since the children were very familiar with the researcher, they asked for clarification on a few items in the questionnaire. The number of children in each class was under twenty, therefore making it manageable and easy for the researcher to conduct a session with the primary students in Years 3-6. All school personnel, primary students and parents were able to understand English since the school has an international curriculum and all reports and communication of the school has been done in English.
Data Analysis

The following statistical methods were used to realize the research objectives from the stakeholders of the International School of Chonburi as follow.

Objective 1: To identify the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand by using the mean and standard deviation together with frequency and percentage.

Objective 2: To identify the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand by using mean and standard deviation.

Objective 3: To determine the significant difference of attitude towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand by using one-way ANOVA. If there is a significant difference, the Scheffe's Test would be used.

Objective 4: To determine the significant difference of perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand by using one-way ANOVA. If there is a significant difference, the Scheffe's Test would be used.
Table 9. Summary of the Research Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Source of Data or Sample</th>
<th>Data Collection Method or Research Instrument</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To identify the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand</td>
<td>School adults, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi</td>
<td>BAQ-M Questionnaire</td>
<td>Frequency and Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To identify the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand</td>
<td>School adults, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi</td>
<td>Handling Bullying Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To determine the significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand</td>
<td>School adults, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi</td>
<td>BAQ-M Questionnaire</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Hoc Analysis: Scheffe's Test in case of significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To determine the significant difference of perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand</td>
<td>School adults, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi</td>
<td>Handling Bullying Questionnaire</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Hoc Analysis: Scheffe's Test in case of significant difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter represents analysis and interpretation of data gathered from the questionnaires returned by the respondents. The objective of this study was to identify the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying as well as, identifying if there was a significant difference in attitudes towards bullying and perception towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. There were 96 questionnaires distributed with 22 questionnaires distributed to school personnel, 37 to students and 37 to parents. The researcher received all 96 questionnaires back which was a 100% response rate.

Research Finding for Objective 1

The first research objective was to identify the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand through descriptive statistics. Data analysis used for this objective was mean and standard deviation. This objective categorized the attitude towards bullying in three different areas (1) perceived seriousness of bullying, (2) whether or not they identify the situation as bullying and (3) empathy towards victims of bullying. There are three types of bullying in these six vignettes, with two vignettes for each type of bullying behavior. These three types of bullying are physical, verbal, and social exclusion.
1.1 Perceived Seriousness

The results of the data presented to identify the attitude towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand show the mean and standard deviation for perceived seriousness.

Table 10. Mean and Standard Deviation of Perceived Seriousness of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>School personnel (n=22)</th>
<th>Students (n=37)</th>
<th>Parents (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbal</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbal</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Exclusion</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Exclusion</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 10, in terms of the attitude of perceived seriousness, school personnel has the highest mean score of 4.42 followed by the student group with a mean score of 4.31 and last is the parent group with a score of 3.95. All three groups indicated that their attitude towards bullying is high in terms of perceived seriousness, from the six vignettes presented.
Data collected from school personnel indicate that physical bullying in vignettes 2 and 4 yield the same result at 4.91. From the data above, it is clear that physical bullying is very serious to school personnel because it is ranked very high in perceived seriousness. It is interesting to note that although, vignettes 5 and 6 are both bullying in the form of social exclusion they are ranked at the second highest and lowest according to the mean of perceived seriousness. Vignette 5 is ranked at 3.77 which is the lowest mean and Vignette 6 falls just under the highest score at 4.41. This indicated that there is still some inconsistency in the attitude of how seriously school personnel view bullying in social exclusion scenarios. School personnel responded to all vignettes as either high or very high, which can be translated to either serious or very serious issues.

The results from the students indicated that the seriousness of bullying was given to physical and social exclusion scenarios. The results from the data collected from the students indicated the highest score to be from Vignette 4, which was physical bullying at 4.65. Interestingly enough, the next highest mean score came from Vignette number 6, social exclusion, which is 4.57. The lowest mean score from the students came from Vignette 1, verbal bullying which indicated to have a mean score of just 3.7. All vignettes according to students fall into the high or very high category. Students attribute both physical and social exclusion forms of bullying to what they perceived as very serious.

Parents also attributed the highest mean scores to bullying scenarios that are physical, as in Vignette 2 having the highest mean of 4.73 and Vignette 4 coming in second at 4.65. This showed that parents would consider bullying as very serious if it were in the physical form. The lowest mean score from data collected from the parents comes from
Vignette 5, social exclusion, at 3.03 which is interpreted as a moderate score. The parent group is the only group that has categorized a bullying scenario as moderate in terms of perceived seriousness. Parents did not consider social exclusion to be a serious issue to be dealt with.

1.2 Is this bullying?

In this section, the researcher reports the findings for the answer to whether or not they considered the scenarios in the vignettes to be bullying? The data analysis in this section presents the frequency and percentage of the response to the question ‘Is this bullying?’

Table 11. Frequency and Percentage to “Is this bullying?” of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>School personnel (n=22)</th>
<th>Students (n=37)</th>
<th>Parents (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Frequency (Percent)</td>
<td>Yes Frequency (Percent)</td>
<td>No Frequency (Percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbal</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>1 (0.04)</td>
<td>36 (97.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>- (0.00)</td>
<td>37 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbal</td>
<td>3 (13.64)</td>
<td>19 (86.36)</td>
<td>34 (91.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical</td>
<td>- (0.00)</td>
<td>- (0.00)</td>
<td>- (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social</td>
<td>4 (18.18)</td>
<td>18 (81.82)</td>
<td>2 (5.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>(18.18)</td>
<td>(81.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social</td>
<td>2 (9.09)</td>
<td>20 (90.91)</td>
<td>3 (8.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>(9.09)</td>
<td>(90.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (6.82)</td>
<td>123 (93.18)</td>
<td>10 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |                         |                 |                |                         | 174 (78.38)           |
Table 11 demonstrated that, 95.5% of all students considered the vignettes to be bullying and 93.18% of all school personnel considered all scenarios presented in the six vignettes to be bullying. It is to be noted that where the school personnel and students idea of bullying is very close, there is a clear and difference when it comes to the parent group. Only 78.38% of parents considered the vignettes to constitute as bullying.

School personnel unanimously agreed that Vignettes 1, 2 and 4 which are physical and verbal scenarios of bullying are what they considered as bullying. The lowest percentage as identifying whether or not this scenario is bullying came from vignette 5, which was social exclusion at 81.82 percent.

All children agreed that Vignettes 2 and 4, both of which are physical forms of bullying are classified as bullying scenarios. Interestingly, the lowest percentage as identifying whether or not this scenario is bullying comes from Vignette 3, which placed verbal bullying at 89.19 percent. It should be noted that the second highest percentage was also verbal bullying which was at 97.3.

The only vignette that parents had a complete agreement on is Vignette 2, physical bullying which was 100 percent. This vignette is once again a depiction of a physical bullying scenario. Vignette 4, also physical bullying came in second in terms of identifying a scenario as to whether it is a bullying situation or not at 97.30 percent. The lowest percentage in this category is 43.24 percent from Vignette 5, which indicated that less than half the parents felt that social exclusion is a form of bullying.
1.3 Empathy

The results of the data presented to identify the attitude towards bullying of school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand show the mean and standard deviation in terms of empathy. There are three types of bullying in these six vignettes, with two vignettes for each type. These three types of bullying are physical, verbal, and social exclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>School personnel (n=22)</th>
<th>Students (n=37)</th>
<th>Parents (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbal</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbal</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 12, the overall scores were highest for school personnel at 4.49 followed by students at 4.47. The parent group had an overall mean score of 4.18 in terms of empathy for all
the vignettes. All results indicated that the scenarios presented in the vignettes point to a high to very high empathy towards victims in bullying scenarios.

Data collected from school personnel indicated that physical bullying in vignettes 4 showed the highest empathy which is 4.86 followed by 4.77 from Vignette 2. The lowest empathy for victims came from Vignette 5, social exclusion, with a mean score of 4.05. All results indicated that the scenarios presented in the vignettes point to a high to very high empathy towards victims of bullying scenarios.

The results from the data collected from the students indicated the highest score to be from Vignette 4, physical bullying, at 4.7. The next highest mean score comes from Vignette number 2, physical bullying, which is 4.65. Students had very high empathy towards victims of physical bullying. They had least empathy for victims of verbal bullying. The lowest mean score from the students come from Vignette 1, verbal bullying, with a mean score of 4.08. All vignettes indicated that students had either high or very high empathy towards victims of bullying.

Parents also attributed the highest level of empathy to victims of bullying scenarios that are physical. Both Vignettes 2 and 4, physical bullying received the exact mean score of 4.65. The lowest empathy is towards victim of social exclusion from data collected from the parents comes from Vignette 5, social exclusion, at 3.51. As the table shows all three groups had either high or very high empathy towards the victims of bullying in all scenarios.
Table 13. Mean and Standard Deviation for Attitude on Bullying of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Personnel ( (n=22) )</th>
<th>Students ( (n=37) )</th>
<th>Parents ( (n=37) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Seriousness</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 depicts that the overall attitudes towards bullying is equal for school personnel and students. Both groups have a total mean score in all three aspects at 4.84. In terms of perceived seriousness, empathy and is this bullying, both groups indicated that they are highly aware of the seriousness, they also empathize with the victims at a high level and indicated that the situations constitute as bullying. The parent group has a total mean score of 4.28 when it comes to their attitude towards bullying. As the table above indicated they have shown only moderate levels of awareness in terms of how serious bullying can be and not knowing if the situation constitutes as bullying or not. Although parents do show a high level of empathy towards the victims, the other results do not match.
Research Finding for Objective 2

The second research objective was to identify the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand through descriptive statistics. Data analysis used to answer this question was mean and standard deviation. The perception towards handle bullying was categorized into five different areas (1) working with the bully, (2) working with the victim, (3) enlisting other adults, (4) disciplining the bully and (5) ignoring the incident.

Table 14. Mean and Standard Deviation of Components of Perception Towards Handling Bullying of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for Handling Bullying</th>
<th>School Personnel (n=22)</th>
<th>Students (n=37)</th>
<th>Parents (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the bully</td>
<td>4.37  0.57</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>3.9   0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the victim</td>
<td>3.53  0.9</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>4.14  0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisting other adults</td>
<td>4.14  0.54</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>3.22  0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining the bully</td>
<td>4.39  0.57</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>4.62  0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring the incident</td>
<td>1.74  0.82</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1.49  0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.63  0.38</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>3.69  0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 14, in terms of the perception towards handling bullying it is indicated that students have the highest mean score of 3.69 followed by school personnel with a mean score of 3.63 and last is the parent group with a score of 3.53. All three groups have reported that they would likely do something to handle bullying.

School personnel would very likely discipline the bully because they showed a mean score of 4.39. Next, they would very likely work with the bully which showed a mean score of 4.37. School personnel also reported a 1.74 which indicated that they would never ignore the incident. The overall mean for school personnel's perception towards bullying is at the mean score of 3.63 which shows that they would likely use one of the five strategies to handle bullying.

Students would very likely discipline the bully and enlist other adults. The mean score for both these strategies were 4.62 and 4.32, respectively. Students also reported a 1.49 mean score which indicated that they would never ignore the incident. The overall mean for students' perception towards handling bullying was at 3.69 which shows that they would likely use one of the five strategies to handle bullying.

Parents would likely enlist other adults to handle bullying. Data from the table showed a mean score of 4.08. The next is they would likely work with the bully, which has a mean score of 4.06. Parents reported a 1.98 mean score which indicated that they would never ignore the incident. The overall mean for parents' perception towards handling bullying is 3.53, which means that they would likely use one of the five strategies to handle bullying.
Research Finding for Objective 3

This research objective was to determine if there was a significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. The hypothesis for this objective was that there is a significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand at the level of .05.

To compare the attitude towards bullying among school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi, the researcher used one-way ANOVA. The research finding is displayed in table 15.

Table 15. Comparison of attitude towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The analysis from Table 15 shows a significant difference at the level of .05. The stakeholders have a difference in attitude as stated in the hypothesis. The results showed a significant difference in attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders and in order to be able to identify exactly where the difference stems from, the researcher conducted a Scheffe's Test to know exactly where the difference lies.
Table 16. Post-Hoc Scheffe's Test on Attitudes towards bullying among Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 indicated that parents' attitudes towards bullying are significantly different from that of school personnel and students at the level of .05.

Research Finding for Objective 4

This research objective was to determine if there is a significant difference of perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. The hypothesis for this objective was that there is a significant difference of perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand at the level of .05.

To compare the perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, the researcher used one-way ANOVA. The research finding is displayed in table 21.
Table 17. Comparison of Perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 17 shows that there is no significant difference at .05 in the overall perception towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi. The results indicated a p-value of 0.18 which is higher than .05, which means that hypothesis is not accepted.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of a summary of the study, a brief review of the conclusion, discussion of the findings and the recommendation for school's administrators and primary schools as well as suggestions for future research.

Summary of the Study

This study was a comparative study of attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. There were four objectives in this study:

1. To identify the attitudes towards bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.
2. To identify the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.
3. To determine if there is a significant difference of attitudes towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.
4. To determine if there is a significant difference of perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

The researcher would like to determine the attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying and compare the responses of school personnel, students and
parents, all of which are stakeholders. All 96 questionnaires were distributed to all three groups with a 100 percent response rate from the selected school.

Conclusions

This research was a comparative study of attitudes towards bullying and perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

The findings for research objective 1 identified the attitudes of stakeholders in three different aspects. The research identified the three aspects of attitude towards bullying as (1) perceived seriousness, (2) is this bullying? (3) empathy. The results of how the three groups perceived seriousness of bullying according to the scenarios described in the six vignettes presented could be interpreted as very low to very high.

All six vignettes fall into 3 different types of bullying (1) physical (2) verbal and (3) social exclusion. There were six vignettes presented with each type of bullying accounting for two vignettes. The first aspect of attitude towards bullying was perceived seriousness of the situation in the vignettes. The results showed that school personnel and parents interpret physical bullying as 'very high' in terms of perceived seriousness. School personnel had a very high mean score for vignettes 2 and 4 with an identical mean score at 4.91. Parents had a very high mean score for vignettes 2 and 4 with a mean score of 4.73 and 4.65, respectively. On the other hand, students interpreted physical and social bullying as 'very high' in terms of perceived seriousness. The mean score for very high in the student group comes from vignette 4 and 6 that
shows a score of 4.65 and 4.57, respectively. School personnel and students interpreted every vignette to be either 'high' or 'very high' for perceived seriousness. The parent group is the only group which has responses that are 'moderate' to 'very high' in perceived seriousness. The response moderate generated by parents actually came from a scenario from vignette 6 that depicts social exclusion.

The second aspect of attitude towards bullying deals with the question 'is this bullying?' as an assessment of the situation in the vignettes. All respondents at 100% unanimously agreed that vignette 2 is a case of bullying. Another physical bullying depiction in vignette 4 showed that 100% of school personnel and students believed the situation to be bullying; however, 97.3% of parents think that it is. As for verbal bullying in Vignette 1 shows that 100% of school personnel, 97.3% of students and 81.08% of parents think it is bullying. Vignette 3, which is another scenario of verbal bullying shows that 86% of school personnel, 89.19% of students and 75.68% of parents thought of it as bullying. As for social exclusion in Vignette 5 showed that 81.82% of school personnel, 94.59% of students and 43.24% of parents considered this to be a bullying situation. The last vignette, the sixth scenario which is also a form of social exclusion resulted in 90.91% of school personnel, 91.89% of students and 72.97% of parents that considered it to be a bullying situation.

The final aspect of attitude towards bullying deals with the question empathy towards victims in the situation as described in the vignettes. All three groups showed 'very high' empathy towards victims of physical bullying in vignettes 2 and 4. School personnel had a mean score for vignettes 4 and 2 at 4.86 and 4.77, respectively. Students had a mean score for
vignettes 4 and 2 at 4.7 and 4.65, respectively. Parents showed an identical mean score of 4.65 for both vignettes 4 and 2.

In terms of empathy, school personnel ranked the following vignettes according to their mean scores following physical bullying scenarios that they empathized with in the following order: vignette 6 (4.5) vignette 1 (4.41), vignette 3 (4.36) and last vignette 5 (4.05). The results of the mean scores from student data actually displayed a pattern in terms with empathy towards the victim. The mean scores from the study shows that they ranked empathy as the following physical, social exclusion and verbal bullying. Social exclusion with vignettes 6 and 5 have mean scores of 4.65 and 4.43, respectively. The mean score for both vignette 6 and vignette 4 were the same. Verbal bullying as depicted in vignettes 3 and 1 had a mean score of 4.3 and 4.08, respectively. As for parents, in terms of empathy, the researcher has ranked the following vignettes according to their mean scores following physical bullying scenarios that they empathized with in the following order: vignette 6 (4.3) vignette 1 (4.1), vignette 3 (3.84) and the last vignette 5 (3.51). The overall mean scores in terms of attitude towards bullying of both school personnel and students were at 4.84 with the parent group possessing a mean score of 4.28.

The findings of research objective 2 identifies the perception towards handling bullying of stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. The research identified the five components of perception towards handling bullying which included (1) working with the bully, (2) working with the victim (3) enlisting other adults (4) disciplining the bully and (5) ignoring the incident.
School personnel were very likely to discipline the bully with a mean score of 4.39. The next was they were very likely to work with the bully, with a mean score of 4.37. The lowest mean score came from never “ignoring the incident” at 1.74. Students would very likely discipline the bully, with a mean score of 4.62. The next was they were very likely to enlist other adults, with a mean score of 4.32. The lowest mean score came from never “ignoring the incident” at 1.49. Parents' results revealed their perception towards handling bullying to be that they would likely enlist other adults, with a mean score of 4.08. The next was it is likely that they would work with the bully” which had a mean score of 4.06. The lowest mean score came from never “ignoring the incident” at 1.98.

The research findings indicated that research objective three results were statistically significant. This confirms the hypothesis that there is a significant difference of attitude towards bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand at the level .05.

In order to understand the difference, a post-hoc Scheffe’s Test was conducted to find the difference. The difference was shown in the parent group, whereas, school personnel and students did not show any statistic difference.

The research findings indicated that the research objective four results were not statistically significant. There was no significant difference in perception towards handling bullying among stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand.

Discussion

Successful bullying prevention programs depend upon teacher's attitude and their willingness to intervene when they have knowledge of such situations going on. Teachers play
an essential role in creating a positive school climate (Yoon & Kerber, 2003) and are the ones that is expected to handle a bullying incident (Smith & Thompson, 1991). Teacher attitudes are crucial to an implementation of a bullying prevention or intervention program because they are the key component (Olweus, 1993). The aim of this quantitative study was to try to measure these attitudes from the stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi. The stakeholders' responses to the questionnaires showed a series of important facts. According to the first research question, what are the attitudes towards bullying stakeholders at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand it is clear that all groups rate physical bullying to be perceived as serious and empathize most with the victims and the majority of respondents in the study agreed that it is without a doubt bullying. According to the Yoon and Kerber (2003) physical bullying was perceived as most serious and the lowest was social exclusion. This was identical in this study. Based on the Social-Ecological Systems Theory, students will model the behaviour that is acceptable to the group they are in. Students are involved with school personnel, parents and their peer in this microsystem. They are directly influenced by what they see is acceptable and modeled to them. Therefore, bullying is not only about a personality type. According to the social ecological context, bullying is a phenomenon that has been cultivated based on their interactions with influences from their social system. Therefore, if bullying was not considered serious in a school by the school personnel, the expected outcome for the research would be that it was not considered to be a serious issue. However, parents are not directly involved in the school's social system; therefore, their responses would be different. Their responses, according to the theory, would stem from their background, culture and the microsystems that they grew up with. An interesting observation that the researcher has made is the fact that the ranking of
perceived seriousness between the school personnel and students are exactly the same. This would be a good indication that what the school personnel finds to be unacceptable behavior becomes a model for the children at school. It is very encouraging to see that the perceived seriousness is proof that children model acceptable behavior from the grown ups that they see at school.

According to Bauman and Del Rio (2006) in their previous studies, verbal bullying and social exclusion were not considered to be serious matters and not usually acted upon. These results were also reflected in the parent group. Parents paid serious attention to physical bullying and not taken social exclusion bullying seriously, rating it as moderate. However, both the school personnel and students had a higher mean score for vignette 4, different from the parents. When the researcher examines the scenario in the questionnaire, it says that in vignette 4 they see the actual incident and that is probably an explanation as to why it has a higher mean score for school personnel and students. Interestingly enough, vignette 2 shows no indication of a physical attack, rather it is a threat to hit but it received a higher mean score from parents. Another interesting aspect of the attitude towards perceived seriousness of bullying scenarios is how much more less serious the form of bullying through social exclusion is thought of by parents. The researcher was quite surprised to find that less than half of the parents did not think of social exclusion as a very high or even high to indicate that it is a serious matter. This is an area that will help the school fill in the gaps when setting up a bullying prevention program.

Physical bullying is more obvious to all groups followed by verbal bullying and coming in last, is identifying that social exclusion is a form of bullying as well.
Lastly in terms of empathy, the grown ups which consists of school personnel and parents empathize with the situations from the vignettes in the exact same order. However, the children, according to the mean scores on empathy gave a clear indication that they empathize most with victims of physical, social exclusion and then finally verbal bullying. The results on empathy sheds a light on what children deem to be important and how they would take care of the victims in bullying situations. This indication is a very important stepping stone and a message to the school that it is necessary to work with the victims just as much as trying to fix the problem with the bully. Sometimes, parents dismiss how actions from social exclusion can be daunting for children facing the situation, which shows in their response on perceived seriousness. It is very important for all parties involved in dealing with children to become aware of such situations because it is very discreet and subtle when compared with an outright physical or verbal form of bullying. The results of this study support previous studies that social exclusion is taken less seriously, and are less likely to intervene when they witness verbal or physical aggression. Without consistent, effective consequences, socially exclusive behaviours will continue to take place. That is, when school personnel or parents ignoring of such behaviours, it is likely that students will understand that such behavior is acceptable, sending an inappropriate message that social exclusion is tolerated and even allowed.

The second research question focuses on the perception towards bullying of school personnel, student and parents at the International School of Chonburi, Thailand. The results of this question has actually confirmed the researcher's initial thoughts on how each group's perception towards bullying would be. The analysis revealed that school personnel showed a
high mean score in the areas that concern the bully. School personnel may have a belief that they have to fix the situation that arises within the classroom or at school. Therefore, the high mean scores come from (1) disciplining the bully and (2) working with the bully. It is very likely that they believe that bullies have to be aware of the consequences of unacceptable behavior and further to that they need to work on strategies to deal with how to prevent the situation from taking place. This goes back to the Theory of Coping, in which school personnel are more problem-focused and will look for a solution that requires the problem to be fixed. It is the job of school personnel to make sure that schools are a safe place for all children and consequences and setting targets for acceptable behavior is therefore crucial in making sure that these kind of situations are prevented and dealt with right away. As for students, once again the researcher expected that the students would be making it an important factor to enforce discipline on the bully. It is clear that they are aware from current school rules that actions and behaviors have consequences. They have applied that frame of mind when responding to the perception towards handling bullying.

However, when looking at the data collected from students, it is indicated that the bully should be disciplined and they would expect that from the grown ups at school to provide consequences of bullying behavior. This lends to a more emotion-focused side of the theory of coping. They feel that they need to reach out to another adult to help them with the situation. Furthermore, the students' results in a high mean score towards enlisting other adults to help with the situation. This answer, according to the researcher indicates that children feel that they are not equipped to deal with bullying on their own. They do want adults to help them with the situation and support them if they are going through the ordeal themselves.
Last but definitely not the least are the parents. In the results from the parents, they too seem to be focused on the emotion side of the situation. They would enlist the help of other adults in order to find some kind of understanding to dealing with the situation. Perhaps, they are limited in their skills of overcoming a negative social issue. Parents have chosen to enlist other adults, according that component having the highest mean score. The researcher has witnessed that parents are sometimes unsure about how they should deal with a situation regarding their children. They often look to school administrators and teachers for support. The response, therefore, does not come as a surprise to the researcher because it indicates that parents need a confirmation or a sounding board before they proceed to act. Parents have the best interests of their children at heart and that is why they are careful before taking an action on an unfamiliar territory and enlisting other adults to assist them makes sense to them. The next component that received a high score is working with the bully. The researcher believes that once the parents have the support and clarification on what to do they are prepared to work with the bully to eliminate the problem. This could also be an indication of support towards the school. Parents seem to be ready to work with the school and teacher and lend a hand on helping the bully put an end to their behavior.

One astonishing discovery that was quite unexpected for the researcher is that not anyone group has chosen to ignore the bullying incident. Previous studies suggested differently, a study from Bauman and Del Rio (2006) indicated that teachers or school personnel did not deal with these issues on bullying because they thought that it would take away their instruction time. Misha et al (2005) also stated that when it came to bullying, the common thought was that it is common and happens to all children, they will outgrow it and learn how to deal with it
because it doesn't cause much distress. It is widely known that bystanders who ignore bullying are actually cultivating the bullying behavior in the long run. It is a positive sign when all groups involved are ready to work on improving and eliminating a problem such as bullying. Hence, the response towards ignoring the incident was the lowest. This result is very encouraging because the researcher is now able to understand how the three groups think and there is evidence of that thought process that helps support prevention efforts.

According to the findings for research question 3, the results of the study show a significant difference of attitude towards bullying among school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi. The difference of attitudes among school personnel, students and parents are present in all three areas of the attitude which are (1) perceived seriousness (2) is this bullying? (3) empathy. Mainly the difference is between the parents and the other two groups. School personnel and students seem to be on the same page, whereas, parents perceive the seriousness of the issues, defining bullying and empathy to be quite different from the two groups.

The results from research question 4, depicts the results of the study to show that overall there is no statistically significant difference of attitude towards bullying among school personnel, students and parents at the International School of Chonburi. The significant difference that has been observed stems from three of the five components. The components (1) working with the bully (2) working with the victim and (3) disciplining the bully all show significant difference. The other two components which are (1) enlisting other adults and (2) ignoring the incident show no significant difference among the three groups.
The group of school personnel and students differ in their perception towards bullying in the sense that school personnel will work with the bully to eradicate the issue; whereas, students, did not make that a priority. In fact, the results revealed quite an interesting development in difference of perception towards bullying. Students feel that it is important to work with the victims and that is where they have a higher mean score as compared to school personnel. This is significant to the researcher because the students, through this study, have made a point to remind the grown ups to remember the feelings of the victims. This finding is in agreement with a research from Rigby (2002) in which students felt that school personnel did not do enough towards the situation as the students had expected them to. The students felt that more could have been done from the part of school personnel. In the pursuit of eradicating bullies, the strategies might be construed towards working with bullies and not paying enough attention to what is going on with the victims. The researcher feels that this indication has steered a direction for understanding the situation as a whole and dealing with each aspect with the importance it deserves.

Finally, the student and parents differ in their opinions about disciplining the bully. The students show a high mean score for disciplining the bully which translates to the fact that they believe consequences are absolutely essential in dealing with the situation. Finally, it is quite obvious that no group advocates ignoring the incident. This is an area which has reassured the researcher that a prevention program will be supported by all three groups of the school community.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This study offers insight to the minds of the three important areas of the school community, school personnel, students and parents. The study has identified the differences in attitudes and perceptions towards bullying of all three groups. It will be extremely useful to use the data in this study as a means of implementing a bullying prevention program that targets the gaps which are the difference in the mindset amongst the groups. Both the results and the limitations of this study have implications for further research.

The results of this study would be a good starting point for school personnel and parents to pay attention to something that they did not take very seriously in the past. That is that social exclusion is very high on the students' list but not given the same level importance from school personnel and parents. Parents can learn a lot more about what is acceptable behaviour and support that in their homes. Very often, they see social exclusion as child's play. If it is to be closely observed, verbal bullying and social exclusion are more prevalent as children grow up and become adults. Many people are still struggling with a constant bully at the workplace that verbally abuses them or spreads malice and gossip as an indication of power and strength. Students and children do not outgrow bullying, in fact, the domination becomes a habit and for victims, they get used to submission. Forms of bullying evolve with age, but the fundamental reason never changes.

Understanding attitudes towards bullying helps school personnel understand how to convey the idea of intervention and prevention to the parents. They are better equipped with devising a strategy for handling bullying. In the past, some school personnel may simply ask the parents to be involved with dealing with their child that are bullies or victims. Through this
research, that would be a terrible idea because, it is clearly indicated that parents would likely enlist another adult for help. School personnel should not expect that parents would be able to be problem-focused and fix the issue. It is clearly indicated in the research that they need assistance from an adult that they trust will guide them.

When dealing with a situation that is bullying, one must tread carefully. It is important to empower the victim in order to cope with the situation in a manner that is problem-focused. It is true that there is a need for an emotional outlet, but that should be temporary. Fixing the problem, by shifting the students' focus is a temporary relief, not a permanent solution to a serious negative social issue such as bullying.

This study was conducted in a small school environment in which adults and students are closely knit and share a very special relationship. School personnel knows all the students' names at school and therefore can intervene right away because they know the children very well. The students and parents feel at ease when sharing their thoughts with school personnel, because one of the most fundamental philosophies of the school has to do with its open-door policy which enables parents to come in to school at any given time during the day. It would be interesting to see if this result were consistent in all small schools or does it differ with school sizes.

The results also indicate that, for parents social exclusion is not considered to have a high mean as physical bullying does. It would be worth investigating the different areas of social exclusion that would be included in bullying. It is an especially sensitive issue to children, to feel outcasted and ignored. The researcher believes that although physical bullying is more obvious and inflicts physical pain, it is not as if emotional pain is less important. Very
often, children never get over some drastic emotional pain that they have felt as a child which leads to many other psychological disorders. These children that feel the need to fit in and succumb to peer pressure and constantly seeking outside approval because they have been denied that in their past. When conducting workshops for parents and school personnel, it would be recommended that more emphasis is given to underline the importance of being able to identify social exclusion situations and an immediate consequence is very important. Students should not feel that social exclusion is acceptable and permitted or even tolerated at school.

For bigger primary schools in which children get a media device at a very young age and have access to social media and chat forums, there is a big gap in the understanding of how cyberbullying is understood and plays a role in the modern schooling system. The researcher has made a few observations from bigger international schools that allow children as young as 6 years old to take their smart phones to school. Not only do they communicate through texting, blogs and social media such as facebook and youtube, etc. they also have a school based messaging system. When not properly monitored by adults there could be a lot of damage. This is an area where bullying prevails and is so discreet that it is scary. Applications such as snapchats delete messages right after they have been read and leaves no trail of evidence. Although they advice an age, most children still sign up for it and thats when the ball begins to roll. One of the recommendations is for bigger schools to study the attitudes and perceptions towards bullying so that they will be aware at how much support they can garner for a preventive or intervention effort. Bullying prevention involves effort from the school community and cannot succeed without the contribution from its members.
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Appendix A
The Bullying Attitude Questionnaire-Modified (BAQ-MM)

Instructions: Please read the six (6) vignettes and respond to the three (3) questions that follow.

Vignette 1:
At the writing center you hear a student call another student “fatty”. The child tried to ignore the remarks but sulks at his desk. It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:
1. How serious do you rate this conflict?
5 = very serious 4 = serious 3 = moderately serious 2 = not very serious 1 = not at all serious
2. Would you call this bullying?
Yes No
3. I would be upset by the student’s remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?
5 = Strongly Agree 4 = agree 3 = neither disagree or agree 2 = disagree 1 = Strongly disagree

Vignette 2:
Your class is getting ready to go to lunch and students are in line at the door. When you hear one student say to another student, “Hey, give me your lunch money, or I’ll hit you.” The child gives in and eventually gives his/her lunch money to the student. It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:
1. How serious do you rate this conflict?
5 = very serious 4 = serious 3 = moderately serious 2 = not very serious 1 = not at all serious
2. Would you call this bullying?
Yes No
3. I would be upset by the student’s remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?
5 = Strongly Agree 4 = agree 3 = neither disagree or agree 2 = disagree 1 = Strongly disagree
Vignette 3:
A student brings a Harry Potter pencil to school. He is bragging that it was a prize from a game arcade. A jealous student approaches and threatens him demanding the pencil at once. The child refuses at first but eventually gives in. It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:
1. How serious do you rate this conflict?
   5= very serious 4= serious 3= moderately serious 2= not very serious 1= not at all serious

2. Would you call this bullying?
   Yes  No

3. I would be upset by the student’s remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?
   5= Strongly Agree 4= agree 3= neither disagree or agree 2= disagree 1= Strongly disagree

Vignette 4:
As your class returns from music class, you observe a student hit another student in the hallway. You can see that it has caused bruising. It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:
1. How serious do you rate this conflict?
   5= very serious 4= serious 3= moderately serious 2= not very serious 1= not at all serious

2. Would you call this bullying?
   Yes  No

3. I would be upset by the student’s remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?
   5= Strongly Agree 4= agree 3= neither disagree or agree 2= disagree 1= Strongly disagree
Vignette 5:

During centers, you overhear a student say to another, "If you don't let me have the purple marker, I won't invite you to my birthday party." It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:

1. How serious do you rate this conflict?

5= very serious 4= serious 3= moderately serious 2= not very serious 1= not at all serious

2. Would you call this bullying?

Yes  No

3. I would be upset by the student's remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?

5= Strongly Agree 4= agree 3= neither disagree or agree 2= disagree 1= Strongly disagree

Vignette 6:

Your class has been awarded free time because they have worked so hard today. You witness a student say to another, "No, absolutely not. I already told you that you can't play with us." The student is isolated and plays alone for the remaining time with tears in her eyes. It is not the first time this has happened.

Questions:

1. How serious do you rate this conflict?

5= very serious 4= serious 3= moderately serious 2= not very serious 1= not at all serious

2. Would you call this bullying?

Yes  No

3. I would be upset by the student's remarks and feel sympathetic toward the victim?

5= Strongly Agree 4= agree 3= neither disagree or agree 2= disagree 1= Strongly disagree

The BAQ survey was developed by Craig et al (2000). The BAQ-M was adapted by Yoon and Kerber (2003) and Kinan (2010).
The Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ)

Teachers have alternative ways of dealing with incidents of bullying in a school.

To some extent, what is done depends on the circumstances in which the bullying takes place, and the severity of the bullying. It is, of course, sometimes difficult to generalize, but in answering the following questions, indicate what you think you **might** do.

Imagine the following scenario:

A 12-year-old student is being repeatedly teased and called unpleasant names by another, more powerful, student who has successfully persuaded other students to avoid the targeted person as much as possible. As a result, the victim of this behaviour is feeling angry, miserable, and often isolated.

*Please tick the answer which is closest to what you think you would do.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I definitely would</th>
<th>I probably would</th>
<th>I'm unsure</th>
<th>I probably would not</th>
<th>I definitely would not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would insist that the bully “cut it out.”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would treat the matter lightly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would make sure the bully was suitably punished.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would discuss the matter with my colleagues at school.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would convene a meeting of students, including the bully or bullies, tell them what was happening, and ask them to suggest ways they could help improve the situation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would tell the victim to stand up to the bully.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would make it clear to the bully that his or her behaviour would not be tolerated.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would leave it for someone else to sort out.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would share my concern with the bully about what happened to the victim, and seek to get the bully to behave in a more caring and responsible manner.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I would let the students sort it out themselves.

11. I would suggest that the victim act more assertively.

12. I would discuss with the bully options from which he or she could make a choice in order to improve the situation.

13. I would ask the school counsellor to intervene.

14. I would refer the matter to an administrator (e.g., principal, vice-principal, dean).

15. I would contact the victim's parents or guardians to express my concern about their child's well-being.

16. I would just tell the kids to "grow up."

17. I would encourage the victim to show that he or she could not be intimidated.

18. I would ignore it

19. I would help the bully achieve greater self-esteem so that he or she would no longer want to bully anyone.

20. I would insist to the parents(s) or guardian(s) of the bully that the behaviour must stop.

21. I would find the bully something more interesting to do.

22. I would advise the victim to tell the bully to "back off."

In using this questionnaire cite The Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ) (Bauman, Rigby & Hoppa, 2008).

Note: Feel free to make copies and use at your school with staff members. Afterwards you may find it useful to discuss why members answered as they did. It can be used to identify there is a general consensus or differences of opinion in a school staff about how cases of bullying should be handled.