

CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was generously funded by the National Crime Prevention Strategy, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, and was undertaken in partnership with the Canadian Initiative for the Prevention of Bullying (led by Drs. Wendy Craig, Shelley Hymel and Debra Pepler).

The project team consisted of Dr. Mark Totten, Principal Author and Research Consultant, Perpetua Quigley, Project Coordinator, and Melinda Morgan, Research Assistant.

We are indebted our national advisory committee (NAC), the research advisory committee (RAC), key informants, reviewers, and schools. Without their direction, critical feedback and support, this project would not have been possible.

Members of the NAC include: Dr. Bob Glossop, Vanier Institute of the Family; Noreen Haire, Canadian Teacher's Federation; Nishad Khanna, Student's Commission; Sharon Jollimore, Canadian Parks and Recreation Association; Sue O'Sullivan and Carson Fougere, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police; Daniel Riendeau and Audrey Lorimer, National Crime Prevention Centre.

Members of the RAC include: Drs. Debra Pepler, LaMarsh Centre for Conflict Resolution; Wendy Craig, Department of Psychology, Queen's University; Shelley Hymel, University of British Columbia; and David Smith, Department of Education, University of Ottawa.

The SPSS database management of Monica Prince (Prince Computing, Ottawa) was invaluable.

The administrators and teachers at the seven participating schools embraced this project whole-heartedly and have demonstrated a keen commitment and vision to make their schools peaceful and safe learning communities.

Over 800 parents took time out of their busy lives to take part in this study. Their contribution is unique, in that their combined effort resulted in the largest matched parent - child sample on bullying, discrimination and sexual harassment in Canada.

Finally, more than 2,500 different students completed surveys and provided important narratives related to their experiences during the 2003 – 2004 school year. They have made a significant and valuable contribution to Canadian research and interventions in the area of school safety.

We thank you all.

VOICES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

“I don’t know, you can’t really reduce or prevent bullying because no matter how much you punish the bullie he can’t stop because when the bully bullies it makes him feel good it makes him feel powerful.” (Grade seven girl)

“We could tell the government and we could say that lets make a law.” (Grade four girl)

“When there is any sort of bullying or harassment going on the police should be called and that person should be suspended from school for the rest of there lives. That is why teenager’s are the way they are to-day. Bold rude ignorant I should no I have one of them.” (Mother of grade 7 girl)

“We experience the effects of bullying in our older special needs students. Once they are placed in a segregated cluster program, they display the behaviours that were done to them. Especially social bullying, but also verbal and physical bullying. We coach them and try to teach them that bullying is not the way to treat people, but years of mistreatment has had a powerful influence.” (Male teacher)

“I think (school) could have small adults in the school to spy on bullies so the bullies won’t see them comming and that would reduce bullying, because grown ups are so much taller than us so the bullies see them comming.” (Grade seven boy)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.	INTRODUCTION	7
2.1	DEFINING BULLYING, SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION	7
3.	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
3.1	PREVALENCE OF BULLYING, SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION..	9
3.2	EVIDENCE-BASED RESEARCH ON ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAMS	12
4.	CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY METHODOLOGY	21
4.1	SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	21
4.2	QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS AND NARRATIVES	22
4.3	ETHICS AND CONSENT	22
4.4	SAMPLE SELECTION AND CHARACTERISTICS	23
5.	CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY FINDINGS	26
5.1	PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL SAFETY	26
5.2	RATES OF BULLYING, HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION	27
5.3	TELLING OTHERS AND HELPING PEERS	33
5.4	PARENT – CHILD COMMUNICATION	33
5.5	SCHOOL INCLUSION	34
5.6	TEACHER KNOWLEDGE	35
5.7	IMPACT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	36
6.	CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY CONCLUSIONS	38
7.	SOURCES	
	APPENDICES	
A.	Active Consent Form	
B.	Passive Consent Form	
C.	Instructions for Survey Administration	
D.	Table I: Fall 2003 Data by School	
E.	Table II: Spring 2004 Data by School	

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bully-victim problems, sexual harassment and racial discrimination are major public health concerns in Canada's elementary, middle and high schools. Research indicates that these peer relationship problems are commonplace, yet school-based programs have no common standards, little consistency, and lack rigorous evaluation. The current study is part of a multi-pronged national anti-bullying strategy funded by the National Crime Prevention Strategy. Key objectives of this CPHA project include the development and testing of a toolkit for the evaluation of school-based programs and the publication of standards for quality school programs.

In winter 2003, schools were recruited from across the country based upon the following criteria: level of administrator, staff and parent support for the project; capacity to address the needs of victims, perpetrators and other individuals in the school community; written approval of school superintendent and chair of school board; and commitment of administrators to follow the ethical and methodological protocols of the study. The project sought to capture a range of school experiences in the implementation of programs: those without any formalized anti-bullying program, those planning to implement a program, and schools where comprehensive programs had been in place for at least two years. Seven schools located in Manitoba, Quebec, British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Ontario were selected. Three sites had been running a school-wide anti-bullying program for two years or more; three schools were developing a program; and one school did not have any anti-bullying program components in place. Although efforts were made to reflect a diversity of young Canadians, the sample is biased. Only those schools that could adhere to the rigorous ethical procedures of the project (ensuring student safety and support) were selected. Findings cannot be generalized outside of the seven schools in the study. Cross-school comparisons should be interpreted cautiously due to the unique setting of each school.

Five different survey instruments were developed to collect data in fall 2003 from 2,806 individuals and spring 2004 from 2,755 respondents from the seven schools: a grades 4 – 7 survey; a grades 8 – 12 survey; a parent survey; a school staff survey; and a school principal survey. These tools were developed with the guidance of leading experts in the field and are based upon the best instruments available in the world today. Credit must be given to the West Vancouver School District Safe School Surveys and David Smith and colleagues' Anti-Bullying Program Survey. These instruments were critical in the development of the CPHA surveys. The quantitative data were supplemented with a series of audiotaped qualitative interviews with school administrators, teachers and students.

The CPHA Toolkit is now available at no cost to Canadian schools, complete with an easy to use Excel database to facilitate data management and analysis. This toolkit will, for the first time in Canada, guide the standard measurement of the prevalence of bully-victim problems (physical, verbal, social, and electronic), sexual harassment (same- and cross-gender verbal, physical, homophobic) and racial discrimination; provide detailed

data on where and at what time of day these behaviours occur, who and how people at school are involved; and measure the impact of school-based programs.

The student sample was diverse: there were equal numbers of males and females, seventeen percent identified as ethnic or racial minorities, fifteen percent reported that they were of mixed race, and twelve percent identified as First Nations, Inuit or Métis. Seven percent reported that they were gay, lesbian bisexual, or questioning their sexual orientation.

This study addresses key gaps in Canadian knowledge on school safety and provides new data in previously unstudied areas. Over 700 students and their parents were coded to permit comparison of reports. Detailed information was collected on electronic bullying and the multidimensional nature of racial discrimination and sexual harassment. Key findings from this study are grouped into the following areas: perceptions of school safety; rates of bullying and victimization, harassment and discrimination; student reporting and peer support; school inclusion; and impact of program participation. For the purposes of this study, victimization and perpetration reporting frequencies are classified into three categories: *monthly* (once or twice per month), *weekly* (once or more each week), and *never* (behaviour did not happen).

1. Perceptions of school safety: Roughly one out of five students reported that they rarely or only sometimes felt safe. Boys were more likely to say they were fearful of physical attacks, while girls were more likely to report that they feared sexual harassment and social bullying. Parents, on the other hand, rated their child's safety much higher. There were differences in perceptions of safety between the seven schools from the perspectives of school staff, parents and students.
2. Rates of bullying and victimization, sexual harassment and racial discrimination: Student-reported rates of involvement in monthly and weekly bullying (as bullies, victims, and bully-victims) are comparable to the findings of other Canadian and international studies. Approximately one-third of students said they were involved as victims and/or bullies in physical bullying monthly, and one in twenty reported that they were involved as victims and/or aggressors weekly. This form of bullying was highest amongst boys in grades six and seven, and gradually declined thereafter. Parents had minimal knowledge of their child's experiences, particularly if s/he was a bully.

Roughly one in nine students reported weekly victimization by verbal bullying and one in nineteen admitted to bullying others verbally every week. No significant gender differences were found. Parent reports again revealed a substantial lack of knowledge in this area, especially if their child verbally bullied others weekly.

Social bullying was prevalent in all seven schools, with roughly two out of every five students reporting monthly involvement. Girls were most likely to be victims and/or aggressors monthly and victims on a weekly basis, although both genders were equally likely to report bullying others weekly in this manner. A large majority of

parents had no knowledge of their child's experiences in this form of bullying. Most teachers said that they did not have the knowledge nor skills to intervene effectively in this area, and that their schools were poorly equipped to handle social bullying.

Roughly one in eight students said that they experienced electronic bullying (primarily on chat lines, email and cellular phone text messaging) monthly. Older students (grades eight and up) were most likely to be involved, and equal numbers were involved as victims, bullies, or victim-bullies. Again, parents were highly unlikely to be aware of their child's involvement. Teachers and administrators reported that they had poor information in this area and were ill equipped to intervene effectively. A central problem identified by adults was that certain forms of electronic bullying originated outside of school (chat lines, email), yet the impact was carried over into the school and very often was connected to social exclusion and manipulation of friendships.

The prevalence and multi-faceted nature of racial discrimination in young students has not been rigorously investigated in Canada. This study provides new information on young perpetrators and the perceptions of their parents. There was inter-school variation in levels of racist behaviour and victimization. In part, this can be explained by the degree of ethno-racial diversity in each of the seven schools. In one school, ten percent of students reported that they called other students racist names weekly, and just under one-third said that they did this monthly. In another school, one out of every four admitted to doing this monthly, and one of five said they were victimized by this form of racism. Although both schools had roughly equal proportions of ethno-racial minority students (50%), the latter had one primary minority group, whereas the former had greater diversity in the student population. It is interesting that almost all of the parents of these youth denied their child was involved in racist behaviour. Some of these same parents provided narratives on the surveys describing how specific ethnic and racial minorities were the cause of problems in the school. A mother of grade seven boy summed it up this way: "*The (minority groups) ARE the worse to bully students – they have a BAD attitude.*"

This study also provides detailed information on the multidimensional nature of same- and cross-gender sexual harassment amongst young students, including homophobic behaviour. Canadian knowledge in this area is limited, particularly in the area of perpetration by students in middle school. More than one in four students in grades eight – twelve said that they were the victim of unwanted sexual touching at school once or more during a four-week period in 2003. This number had dropped to approximately one out of ten students in 2004. In both time periods, one in twenty students reported that they had been victims of sexual harm at school which could be classified as sexual assault under the Criminal Code of Canada. Finally, one in thirteen students reported that someone at school had made an unwelcome or crude comment about their body weekly. In a majority of these incidents, boys were identified as the aggressors of both male and female victims, and many more females reported harassment compared to males. In two-thirds of these incidents, victims reported that the harassment was collective, involving two or more aggressors.

Homophobic harassment was a common occurrence in the seven schools. One in ten students reported that they had been called gay, a fag, lesbian or other put-downs as an insult weekly. Proportionally, boys were significantly more likely than girls to suffer this form of harassment, and they identified groups of other boys as the aggressors on most occasions. Groups of boys were also most likely to victimize girls in this manner, although female victims said that other girls were the aggressors in one-quarter of the cases. More than one-third of all students reported monthly homophobic harassment. One in fourteen students identified that they were gay, lesbian or bisexual or were questioning their sexual orientation.

Parental knowledge about their child's victimization by sexual harassment was very low. Parents were equally misinformed about the riskiest locations and times of day for their children at school. Teachers indicated a better level of knowledge compared to parents, but there were still large discrepancies between student and teacher responses in this area. Overall, students said that harmful behaviour most often happened after school outside the building on school property. This was closely followed by breaks between classes, classroom time itself, and change rooms. While many students reported that the classroom was a primary location for perpetration and victimization, teachers said that this was just about the safest place in the school. These findings suggest that adults do not see what students see. Adults cannot rely on their own perceptions alone to address peer relationship problems. A grade seven boy provided these words of advice: *Teachers can stop saying "Stop being a tattler" when we report bullying.* A female high school teacher commented: *Bullying takes place right under our noses. Many students speak other languages that we are not fluent in so we don't know what is being said. Obvious bullying is dealt with seriously but the subtle things that kids do to each other happen everywhere in the building and often without our awareness.*

3. Student reporting and peer support: Gender differences are apparent when victims were asked if they had reported incident(s) and to whom they disclosed this information. Variation is also evident between schools; those with the most comprehensive and longstanding programs had the highest report rates. Girl victims in middle school were the most likely to tell others about their victimization. Just over one out of every six victims said that they told the school about the harm done unto them. Girls were more likely than boys to disclose victimization to parents, siblings, or peers. A grade eight girl, commenting on why so few victims tell adults, wrote, *"I think teachers should be there more often! Half of the time kids get bullied and nobody sees it. So when the kid goes to tell the authorities of the school, nobody really believes because there was no one around! So the Kid will be harrassed even more. Because they told."*

Significant gender differences are also evident in levels of empathy for victims. Boys were twice as likely as girls to report that it didn't bother them when students got bullied and that they didn't want it to stop. Similar results were found for racial discrimination. Finally, almost all girls said that sexual harassment of students

bothered them a great deal and they wanted it to stop. Slightly more than one-half of boys did so.

One-third of students reported that they didn't intervene the last time they saw or heard another student being bullied, and only one-quarter said that they helped the victim at the time of the incident. Most respondents said that the reason they didn't intervene was because they were afraid or threatened, or simply did not care. Just under one-half of all male students reported that they ignored the last incident they witnessed or heard about, compared to only one-quarter of girls. These findings are supported by previous Canadian studies in this area. Training boys to intervene and support victims is a key challenge for these seven schools, particularly for the one-fifth of young men who reported that they only harmed students who deserved it.

4. **School inclusion:** Previous studies have reported on how integral peer and teacher support is for student health and success. A female high school teacher, commenting on the lack of emotional support given to developmentally delayed students, wrote: "*Special Ed students are the brunt of much bullying often because they look, talk or act differently. They are easy targets as they lack the intellectual skills to fight back verbally or physical strength to fight at all.*" Data from the current study suggest a negative association between student feelings of belonging/ support and involvement in anti-social behaviour. A school inclusion index was created and students were classified into one of three groups: lacking support, some support, and supported. Substantially more students who lacked support were involved (as perpetrators and victims) in bullying, sexual harassment and racial discrimination. Further, schools which had the highest rates of participation by students in structured outside-of-class activities had the lowest rates of student problems, irrespective of whether or not a formalized anti-bullying program had been implemented. Although one cannot imply causality here, it seems that providing the vast majority of students with meaningful opportunities for engagement in school life is linked to healthy peer relations.
5. **Impact of program participation:** There were no apparent positive effects on bullying and victimization rates for the students who reported that they had participated in school-based anti-bullying programs prior to fall 2003. The data suggest that for these students, participation in an anti-bullying program was associated with being a bully. There was no association for victimization. These findings should be interpreted cautiously, because program fidelity measures (e.g., was the program delivered as intended?) were not systematically undertaken. As well, it is likely that schools required bullies to take part in programs to address their behaviour – meaning that there were likely more bullies amongst the program participants compared to the students who had not taken part in programs. Nevertheless, there is a growing body of evaluation research which indicates that in the absence of a richly resourced, multi-year whole-school community approach, beneficial effects are limited. Students had interesting ideas on dealing with bully-victim problems. One grade four boy wrote "*Get a lie detector machine*"; another grade four boy said, "*Tell bully to stop doing it.*"

Many of the schools had reduced levels of monthly perpetration and victimization in spring 2004. For some, this was likely due to a renewal of whole-school programs, guided by the findings of the first round of surveys. Other schools used the data from the initial surveys to launch new anti-bullying programming, target key problem areas, or strike a task force to develop a safe school plan. It is also possible that those students who engaged in harmful behaviour in 2003 got better at honing in on a smaller number of students who were easiest to hurt in 2004.

Public health policy should play a key role in anti-bullying and harassment programs. Taking a public health approach to peer relationship problems will build the capacity of parents, schools and communities. Development of capacity reduces risk factors. Health promotion is best learned and delivered when it flows from a neighbourhood infrastructure and permeates individuals' daily routines and thinking about healthy living. The *CPHA Assessment Toolkit for Bullying, Harassment and Peer Relations at School* is a companion document to this research report. It has been designed for teachers, school administrators, and ministries of education to address some of the pressing needs identified in this study. In partnership with the Canadian Initiative for the Prevention of Bullying (National Crime Prevention Strategy), this free kit provides a standard way to measure the nature and prevalence of school peer relationship problems, standards for quality programs, and a common set of tools to assess the impact of school-based programs. From a public health perspective, it provides an overview of what works and what doesn't, foundations for best practice standards (cognitive-behavioural instruction and parent training, gender-responsiveness, cultural competency, school environment), and outlines the core school components.

2. INTRODUCTION

“I think my school can prevent bullying by people who get bullied tell adults, and adults telling all children that bullying is bad.” (Grade four girl)¹

In 2002, the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) provided funding to develop a national strategy promoting understanding and action to reduce bullying problems among children and youth.² As part of this multi-pronged strategy, the Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA) was awarded funding for its Anti-bullying Best Practices project. The primary objectives of this project included: identification of evidence-based research on anti-bullying interventions in elementary, middle and secondary schools; development of best practice standards for school-based Canadian anti-bullying programs; and development of an assessment toolkit for testing in selected Canadian sites. A national advisory committee was struck to oversee this project and a research advisory committee guided the research methodology.

2.1 Defining Bullying, Sexual Harassment and Racial Discrimination

The definitions of the key concepts in this project have been adapted from those used in major international and Canadian studies in this area. They are proven to be reliable and valid, having been tested out on hundreds of thousands of school students across the world.³ These same definitions were used in the CPHA survey instruments⁴ which were developed for this study and form part of the CPHA and National Crime Prevention Strategy *Assessment Toolkit for Bullying, Harassment and Peer Relations at School*, the companion document to this research report.⁵ The definitions are based upon the West Vancouver School District *Safe School Surveys*.⁶

To harass someone is to bother, make fun of, trouble or attack them, and this is done repeatedly. Harassment can take many forms, some of which are criminal offenses. Someone who harasses wants to hurt the other person (it’s not an accident), and does or says the same things over and over again. There are three main types of harassment:

- Bullying
- Sexual Harassment
- Racial Discrimination

2.1.1 Bullying

Bullying occurs when a student experiences repeated attacks, over time, by one or more other students who systematically abuse their power. It is a multi-dimensional construct characterized by aggressive behaviour or intentional ‘harm doing’; repetitive, coercive acts over time without provocation; and interpersonal relationships where the victim is powerless to resist and the bully derives status and gratification. There are many ways to bully someone. A bully wants to hurt the other person (it’s not an accident). A bully does or says the same things over and over again. Bullying is about using power over another person. There are four main kinds of bullying.

1. Physical
 - Hitting, shoving, kicking, spitting, beating up on others
 - Damaging or stealing another person's property
2. Verbal
 - Name-calling, mocking, hurtful teasing
 - Humiliating or threatening someone
 - Making people do things they don't want to do
3. Social
 - Excluding others from the group
 - Spreading gossip or rumours about others
 - Making others look foolish
 - Making sure others do not spend time with a certain person
4. Electronic:
 - Using computer, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to:
 - Threaten or hurt someone's feelings
 - Single out, embarrass or make someone look bad
 - Spread rumours or reveal secrets about someone

2.1.2 Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is any unwanted and unwelcome behaviour about sex or gender that interferes with a person's life and makes him/her feel uncomfortable even if the harasser says s/he was only joking. It is not about behaviours a person likes or wants from a peer (e.g., wanted kissing, touching, flirting between a boyfriend/girlfriend). Some examples are:

- rude jokes, sexual remarks, spreading rumours
- sexual put downs
- cat calls, rating appearance, whistling
- insults about sexual orientation
- bragging about sexual relations
- any forced sexual contact (touching, patting, grabbing, kissing)

2.1.3 Racial Discrimination

Discrimination occurs when people are seen as different and/or treated differently because of their racial or ethnic background. Examples include racist names, treating someone as inferior or second-rate, leaving someone out or blaming problems on them because of their religion, skin color, or country of origin.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Prevalence of Bullying, Sexual Harassment and Racial Discrimination

3.1.1 Bullying

Research in many countries suggests that approximately fifteen percent of students admit to being involved in bullying, either as bullies, victims, or victim-bullies. Due to variation in the measures of bullying, time frame investigated, and knowledge level of respondents in these surveys, comparison of rates between countries is difficult.⁷ Data from the 2001-2002 WHO Health Behaviour in School-aged Children survey on eleven – fifteen year-old children from around the world indicates that 11% admit to frequently (defined as 2 – 3 times per month or more) bullying others at school over the previous couple of months. The mean proportions for frequent bullying for 11 year-olds, 13 year-olds and 15 year-olds were 9%, 12% and 13% respectively. Although boys bullied others at far higher rates than girls, the same was not true for victimization in this study: of the 11% of children who reported frequent victimization, gender differences were small. The mean victimization proportions for the three age groups were 15%, 14% and 10% respectively.⁸

National Longitudinal Survey on Children and Youth (NLSCY) Cycle 3 cross-sectional data reveal that of 14, 819 four – eleven year-olds, about 10% were identified by their parents as bullies (the question asks if a child is cruel, bullies and is mean to others, with the choice of ‘never’, ‘sometimes’ and ‘often’). Throughout the different age groups a higher percentage of boys than girls manifested bullying behaviour, with rates ranging from a low of 10.3% (age five years; N = 3338) to a high of 15.5% (age four years; N = 935). In comparison, the rates for girls ranged from 5.6% (age 10 years; N = 555) to 11.9% (age four years; N = 915).

The 2001 Ontario Student Drug Use Survey (N = 4,211)⁹ found that one-quarter of students reported being bullied at school at least once since the start of the school year. Bullying was defined as ‘when one or more people tease, hurt or upset a weaker person on purpose’. More males than females said that they were victims (26.9% and 22.3% respectively), and the incidence ranged from 34.8% of seventh graders (N = 750) to 11.2% of twelfth graders (N = 388). Large differences were found between the public health regions of Ontario, with Toronto students least likely to report victimization (13.7% of 545 students) and South-Western students most likely to say that they were bullied (38.6% of 1,529 students).

In this same study, roughly one-third of students said that they had bullied someone at school at least once, with males reporting a much higher incidence than females (40% vs. 24%). Students in the eighth grade were most likely to report bullying (47.7%; N = 691) and thirteenth graders were least likely (18.3%; N = 313). South-Western and Central-Eastern students were most likely to bully, with Toronto students again being the least likely to report that they had bullied (approximately 40% and 18% respectively).¹⁰

Studies in other countries have found similar results. A 1998 survey on a representative sample of 6,338 grades four – six students in rural South Carolina found that 23% reported victimization and 20% admitted to bullying other students at least several times over three months.¹¹ Fifteen percent of a nationally representative sample of 150,000 Scandinavian students (grades one – nine) reported involvement in bullying over a period of three – five months. Nine percent reported victimization, seven percent admitted to bullying, and one and one-half percent indicated that they were victim-bullies. Of these students, five percent were involved in bullying at least once a week.¹² Approximately 17% of a nationally representative sample of 38,000 Australian students aged seven – seventeen years reported victimization by peers each week.¹³ A 1997-98 study of health behaviour among school-aged children in 27 countries found weekly rates of physical bullying among thirteen year-old students ranging from a low of 1.2% (Sweden [1,357 grade eight students] and England [2,222 grade eight students]) to a high of 9.7% (Latvia). The weekly bullying rate in Canada was 7.3% (n = 2,308 grade eight students) in this same study.¹⁴ An English study reported that nine percent of a convenience sample of 3,500 students in 25 schools admitted to sexual bullying.¹⁵

3.1.2 Sexual Harassment

Peer-initiated sexual harassment is a common occurrence in North American elementary, middle and high schools. Canadian and U.S.A. studies have found that same- and cross-gender harassment begins as early as grade six and is associated with pubertal development and involvement in mixed-gender peer groups. Most investigations have focused on victimization and have not surveyed young students who perpetrate harassment.¹⁶

Data from the 2001-2002 WHO HBSC survey on 7,235 Canadian youth aged 10 – 16 years indicates that greater sexual harassment was experienced by females compared to males, with a slight decrease with age.¹⁷ The Canadian Youth, Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS study found that grades nine and eleven girls were more likely to have sex unwillingly and be pressured to have sex when they did not want to compared to boys. In this same study, girls were significantly more likely to experience sexual jokes, comments or gestures compared to boys in the past two months (32% vs. 20% and 31% vs. 23% respectively).¹⁸ In a recent Centre for Disease Control study across the U.S.A., 12.5% of young women in grades nine - twelve reported being forced to have sexual intercourse.¹⁹ Fourteen years of age is the point at which young women are at greatest risk of sexual assault.²⁰ Other investigations in North American schools have found that girls are at least twice as likely to report experiencing sexual harassment as boys, and also report more serious and negative impacts on their school performance and mental health.²¹

In one of the first North American investigations on young aggressors, Loren McMaster and her colleagues surveyed 1,213 grades six – eight students in seven elementary and middle schools in a large Canadian city on the perpetration of peer sexual harassment. Trained assistants administered questionnaires during class time. They found that both boys and girls reported comparable levels of victimization, a finding inconsistent with

other published studies. The authors hypothesize that gender differences in victimization may emerge later on in adolescence. However, boys were significantly more likely to report perpetrating harassment compared to girls in this same study. McMaster and colleagues found that harassment increased significantly across the middle school grades, and that cross-gender was distinct from same-gender harassment.

Homophobic harassment is an understudied and frequently overlooked form of sexual harassment in Canadian schools. However, evidence suggests that it is pervasive in elementary, middle and high schools.²² Tricia Williams and her colleagues, in a sample of 3,636 adolescents from seventeen high schools in Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, found that sexual minority and questioning youth reported more experiences of victimization by bullying, sexual harassment and physical abuse than heterosexual adolescents. It is common for boys to use homophobic harassment against other boys in school settings, beginning in early adolescence. The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network's 2003 National School Climate Survey on 887 middle and high-school sexual minority students in 48 American states and the District of Columbia found that 84% were verbally harassed because of their sexual orientation. The vast majority said that faculty never or rarely intervened when they were present for these incidents.

3.1.3 Racial Discrimination

“Kill all the dirty, disgusting (minority group), that way, there is no one else to harass.” (Grade ten boy)

In 2002, Canada's 3 million people who were part of a visible minority represented 13% of the non-Aboriginal population aged 15 and over. The majority (84%) were first generation Canadians. Statistics Canada's Ethnic Diversity Survey²³ found that 7%, or an estimated 1.6 million Canadians aged 15 and over, said they had experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in the past five years sometimes or often because of these characteristics. One-in-five (20%) visible minorities, or an estimated 587,000 people, said they felt that they had experienced discrimination or unfair treatment sometimes or often in the five years prior to the survey because of their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion. Blacks were more likely to report feeling that they had been discriminated against or treated unfairly: nearly one-third (32%) of Blacks, or an estimated 135,000, said that they had had these experiences sometimes or often in the past five years, compared with 21% of South Asians and 18% of Chinese.

Data from the 2001-2002 WHO Health Behaviour in School-aged Children survey on 7,235 Canadian youth aged ten – sixteen years indicates that racial/religious discrimination was the least prevalent form of victimization (compared to bullying and sexual harassment) and increased with student's age among males. 1999 U.S. data indicate that 13% of all American students reported that they had been called a hate-related word or name (by racial-ethnic group, results ranged from a low of 12% for Hispanic students to a high of 17% for black students), and 36% reported seeing hate-related graffiti at school.²⁴

3.2 Evidence-based Research on Anti-bullying Programs

3.2.1 Evaluation Criteria

In 1996, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado at Boulder (CSPV) designed and launched a national violence prevention initiative to identify violence prevention programs that are effective. *Blueprints for Violence Prevention* has identified eleven prevention and intervention programs that meet a strict scientific standard of program effectiveness. These model programs have been effective in reducing adolescent violent crime, aggression, delinquency and substance abuse. An additional 21 programs have been identified as promising programs. Over 600 programs have been reviewed by the CSPV. With large scale funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the CSPV has evolved into a major prevention initiative, identifying model programs and providing training and technical assistance to help sites choose and implement a set of demonstrated effective programs with a high degree of integrity.

The Bullying Prevention Program (BPP) is one of the eleven Blueprints of the CSPV. Although it is the only whole-school anti-bullying program endorsed by the CSPV, evaluation studies have produced mixed results. Peter Smith and other investigators have questioned findings reported by Dan Olweus (see below).

Blueprint Program Selection Criteria

CSPV established four evaluation standards for achievement of program effectiveness: an experimental research design; evidence of a statistically significant deterrence effect; replication at multiple sites with demonstrated effects; and evidence that the deterrent effect was sustained for at least one year post-treatment.

- **Strong Research Design** – experimental designs with random assignment or quasi-experimental designs with matched control groups. In random assignment studies, placement of students into experimental (i.e., students participate in the anti-bullying program) or control (i.e., students do not participate in the anti-bullying program) groups is determined only by chance. Researchers can therefore be confident that results are due to the bullying intervention, rather than due to any pre-existing differences between the two groups, or any other factors. Quasi-experimental designs with matched control groups are most commonly used in the evaluation of school-based anti-bullying programs. In these studies, students in control groups are matched as closely as possible to students in experimental groups on characteristics such as age, gender, race, socio-economic status (SES), and income. Randomized assignment does not take place. Accordingly, there is always the chance that the groups will differ on characteristics relevant to program outcome that have not been controlled. Debra Pepler and colleagues argue that the use of controls in schools is very difficult to implement due to wide variation between schools in terms of leadership, culture, and student demographics.

Sample size, attrition, and measurement are also key issues. Sample sizes must be large enough to provide statistical power to detect effects. Loss of study participants over time compromises research integrity because it renders accurate comparison of original and final samples difficult. Finally, outcome measures must be administered fairly, accurately, and consistently to all study participants.²⁵

- Evidence of Significant Deterrence Effects – Very few programs have scientific evidence supporting their effectiveness in reducing the onset, prevalence, or rates of participants’ bullying behaviour. Instead, evidence of deterrence of criminal behaviour, drug use, childhood aggression, and conduct disorder are reported. Gold star rating is reserved for those anti-bullying interventions which reduce the onset of bullying (along with delinquency and/or substance use) in experimental groups using pre and post-tests. Changes in targeted risk and protective factors, on their own, are not sufficient.
- Multiple Site Replication – this is very important for the demonstration of anti-bullying program effectiveness. In the absence of replication in diverse settings (i.e., rural, urban) and with diverse populations (i.e., various ethno-cultural and SES groups), there is a chance that the unique characteristics of the original site are responsible for its effectiveness (e.g., a great leader or substantial neighbourhood involvement).
- Sustained Effects – gold star rating is only applied to those programs which demonstrate a sustained effect at least one year post-intervention, along with evidence that effects are maintained over the long-term. Longitudinal studies are rare, although necessary to achieve this objective. It is noteworthy that the majority of prevention interventions have produced solid evidence that deterrent effects are lost quickly after completion of the program.

3.2.2 Research Abroad

“If someone bullies another kid don’t send them home that’s time off school they like it. Make them do the person that got bullied homework for a week.” (Grade seven boy)

There have been a handful of major evaluation studies of school-based anti-bullying programs outside of Canada. Each study is briefly described below in terms of program components, methods, design, and outcomes.

- a) The Bernese study, Switzerland (Alsaker and Valkanover, 2001)
Pre-test, post-test, control group design (non-random assignment) on program based upon Olweus’ Norwegian model with focus on rules in context of whole school approach. Teachers led the intervention, which also focused on parents (heightened awareness, consistent communication and information-sharing) and peers (group dynamics, peer intervention). Five – seven year-olds in eight kindergartens received the program (N = 152). Eight kindergartens acted as controls (N = 167). Measures included teacher ratings of students and student-nominated peers as bullies and/or

victims. Teachers reported increase in verbal and decrease in physical and indirect bullying. Students in intervention group reported decrease in victim and bully nominations whereas control group children reported increase. All program effects were non-significant.²⁶

- b) The Chicago study, U.S.A. (McMahon et al., 2000)
Pre-test, six months post-test, (no control group) design on the 'Second Step' violence prevention program. Curriculum was used to develop knowledge and skills related to bullying behaviour. Students aged three – seven years in five pre-school and kindergarten classes received program (N = 109). The program involved 28 sessions with small groups of children (five – eight students) once or twice weekly. Twelve lessons focused on empathy training, ten lessons on impulse control, and six lessons focused on anger control. Puppets and role-plays were used in each session. Measures included interviews with students, behavioural observations and teacher ratings of skills and behaviour. There was an observed decrease in student's aggressive behaviour and increase in their knowledge of conflict situations. The authors did not report on levels of statistical significance.
- c) The Sheffield Cooperative Learning study, Sheffield, England (Cowie et al., 1994)
Eleven intervention classes doing cooperative group work (CGW) were compared to five control classes over two years. Students were aged seven – twelve years in sixteen classes in two schools (N = 149). CGW was used to evaluate if creating positive changes in interpersonal relations between students would reduce bully/victim problems. Teachers participated in a two-day workshop and received ongoing support. The only measure used was individual interviews wherein students nominated peers as bullies or victims using class photos. Both control and intervention groups reported increase in bullying behaviour, whereas intervention group reported small decrease in victimization. The authors reported that there was some evidence to suggest that fewer students were perceived as victims in the intervention compared to the control group upon project completion. The authors did not report on levels of statistical significance.
- d) The Finland study, Turku and Helsinki (Salmivalli et al., 2003)
Pre-test, post-test control group design with retest after six months on 48 intervention (16 schools) and 24 control classes (eight schools). The study focused on the roles that students play as bystanders in bully/victim problems. Measures included self-report and peer-nominated questionnaires with students aged nine – twelve years. Teachers were trained to provide curriculum work with classes, intervene with bullies and develop policy. Teachers participated in general training on bullying and victimization and effective interventions. Ongoing consultation was provided by experts to support classroom discussions and rules, student awareness-raising, student self-reflections, and engagement of students to develop solutions. Individual discussions and systematic follow-ups with bullies and victims took place. Pikas' 'Method of Shared Concern' formed the basis of the intervention. Teachers were trained in the use of non-punitive problem-solving approaches, where blaming was not used, to encourage constructive, responsible student behaviour. Significant

program effects were reported, with a decrease in bullying of 16% in the intervention group and increase of 15% in the control group. The youngest children reported the largest decrease in bullying. David Smith and his colleagues transformed percentages and scores reported in this study into Z-scores (non-significant programs effects $Z < 1.96$). Positive program effects were found for self-reported victimization (average $Z = 3.50$ for intervention groups) and bullying (average $Z = 2.17$ for intervention groups).

- e) The Texas study (Expect Respect), U.S.A. (Sanchez et al., 2002)
 Pre-test, post-test control group design (random group assignment) with students in fifth grade in six intervention and six control schools ($N = 1,109$; average age 11 years). Measures included self-report surveys at three time intervals and gender-specific focus groups for students and their teachers. The intervention included classroom education, policy and procedure development, parent education, staff training (including bus drivers), and support services. Teachers learned about bullying and sexual harassment research and interventions, classroom management techniques, and incorporated prevention education into curriculum (12 weekly lessons). Through the use of role-plays, class discussions and written assignments, students learned general knowledge and were taught basic skills. Parents were provided with seminars and newsletters on bully, victim and sexual harassment problems, and were taught about general facts, how to effectively respond, and where to find community resources. Individual and group counseling and community resources were available at school. There was a significant attrition rate, with only 60% of children completing all three self-report surveys. Although there was an increased reporting of bullying and students reported that they were more likely to intervene in bullying incidents, there was no significant increase in student knowledge of bullying.
- f) The Norwegian study, evaluated in the May 1983 – May 1985 Bergen sample (Olweus, 1991, 1993)
 Cross-lagged design (time-lagged with different groups beginning the intervention at different times) with eight and twenty month post-intervention assessments on forty-two primary and secondary schools with 11 – 14 year-olds ($N = 2,500$). At the school level, there were bully/victim conferences, increased supervision, improved playgrounds, distribution of 32-page bully booklets, and regular feedback meetings. Teachers were trained and participated in the development of positive school climate and praising pro-social behaviour of students. The focus in the classroom was on cooperative learning, common positive activities, role-playing, class rules and discussions, and bully/victim reading resources. At the peer level, students were trained to support victims. Serious talks were held with bullies, victims and their parents. Persistent bullies had to change classes or schools. Parents were provided with a four-page bully/victim package and encouraged to participate in parent circles. Measures included student questionnaires and teacher ratings as described in Olweus' Bullying Prevention Program. Students reported approximately 50% reduction in bullying, along with decrease in other anti-social behaviour. It is noteworthy that Olweus' dramatic outcomes have not been replicated in other sites using the

Norwegian model. Control groups were not used and no data regarding levels of significance have been provided. When percentages and scores were transformed into Z-scores (non-significant programs effects $Z < 1.96$), self-reported victimization (intervention group $Z = 11.51$) and bullying (intervention group $Z = 10.17$) were large, as well as reductions in anti-social behaviour ($Z = 4.44$).²⁷

- g) The Norwegian study, evaluated in the 1986 Rogaland sample (Roland, 1989, 1993) Pre-test, post-test design (no control groups) with retesting after three years on thirty-seven primary and secondary schools using the BPP (n = approximately 7,000 students). Evidently, there was unequal implementation of the Norwegian model between schools. Teachers were trained to focus on positive rapport with students, work closely with parents, have talks with bullies, develop pro-social norms and common goals in the classroom, and develop awareness and skills in bystanders. Measures included student questionnaires and teacher interviews focused on degree of program implementation. Increases in bullying and victimization were reported over time (larger effects for boys compared to girls), although better outcomes were reported in schools with full program implementation. When converted to Z-scores, interventions had a non-significant effect on self-reported victimization and bullying.²⁸
- h) The Nov. 1990 – Nov. 1992 Sheffield study, England (Whitney et al., 1994; Smith, 1997; Elsea and Smith, 1998) Pre-intervention and 18 month post-intervention design in 16 primary and 7 secondary schools with students aged 8 – 16 years (N = 6,468). Four control schools were used (non-random group assignment: age-cohorts design with adjacent cohorts; schools with age equivalent subject groups compared) in this replication of Olweus' BPP. Measures included student questionnaires, teacher interviews and program logs for evaluation of whole school program. At the school level, policy development, awareness-raising activities, increased supervision and playground improvement took place. Parents were involved in the development of policy. In the classroom, teachers used cooperative group work, drama, video discussion, quality circles, and harassment and bully/victim literature. Students were trained in counseling skills and provided with an opportunity to volunteer at a 'listening line.' Serious discussions took place with bullies, who also had to participate in 'bully court.' The Pikas Method of Shared Concern was used for work with bullies. Assertiveness training was provided for victims. Significant decreases in bullying in primary school children were reported (roughly 15% decrease), along with increased reporting of bullying to teachers. However, no significant change was reported among secondary school students. The greatest reductions in bully/victim problems were reported in those schools having made the fullest implementation of the intervention. There was a 0.62 correlation (p. <02) between staff involvement and the average primary school bullying rate. When transformed into Z-scores, the primary intervention school effects were positive for self-reported victimization ($Z = 4.10$) and bullying ($Z = 2.22$). Primary control group effects for victimization and bullying were not significant or negative ($Z = -3.16$) respectively. For secondary intervention schools, Z-scores for

victimization (-1.97) and bullying (not significant) were disappointing. The effects for control groups were not significant and positive ($Z=2.97$) respectively.

- i) The 1991 – 1993 Home Office study, Liverpool and London, England (Pitt and Smith, 1995)
In this extension of the Sheffield study, no control groups were used in pre-intervention and post-intervention tests (two years subsequent to program start date). Program components included assertiveness training, a peer support model, and development of anti-bullying policy in two primary and two secondary schools with students aged 8 – 16 years. Based upon self-report surveys (similar to those used in the Sheffield study), students reported significant decreases in bullying in both primary and one secondary school, although students in the second secondary school reported a significant increase.
- j) The 1995 – 2000 Seville study, Spain (Ortega and Lera, 2000)
Pre and post-test design in five primary and secondary schools with students aged 8 – 18 years ($N = 910$), with three control schools (post-testing only). A community-based program was evaluated, having components focused on cooperative group work, empathy and concern for others, and promotion of democratic values. The Seville study was based upon the Sheffield study. The Pikas Method of Shared Concern training was made available for teachers in their work with bullies. Measures included student questionnaires which assessed behaviour, attitudes and program effectiveness. Inconsistent results were reported, with overall decrease in self-reported bullying contradicted with no change in physical and verbal bullying and increases in indirect forms of bullying.
- k) The 1995 – 1997 Flanders study (Stevens et al., 2000)
Olweus' Norwegian study and the Sheffield anti-bullying project formed the basis of the Flanders study, which involved eighteen schools with students aged 10 – 16 years ($N = 1,104$). Twelve schools implemented the program with the help of researchers, six schools implemented without the help of researchers, and the final six schools acted as controls. There was random group assignment. At the school level, zero tolerance policies were implemented and information sessions were held for school staff and parents. Teachers participated in comprehensive training. They were taught to implement cognitive perspective taking, problem-solving strategies, social skills training and rules in the classroom. At the individual level, support was provided for victims, bullies were punished, and contracts were developed between teachers and bullies. Measures included self-report questionnaires at eight and twenty months post-intervention. A slight but statistically significant decrease in bullying was reported in primary schools that received the program, with or without the support of researchers. No statistically significant change in bullying was found in the secondary schools. The authors concluded that empathy towards victims decreases as children progress through secondary school.
- l) The 1995 – 1997 New South Wales study, Australia (Petersen and Rigby, 1999)\

Pre-test post-test design without a control group was used in one secondary school with students aged 12 – 17 years. The program emphasized peer involvement in anti-bullying work and the use of the Pikas Method of Shared Concern by teachers. At the school level, policies and curricula were developed and teachers were supported to report bully/victim problems. A peer-led anti-bullying committee was formed, peer helpers provided support for victims, a newcomers group was formed, and students were engaged in artistic and public speaking activities. At the individual level, victims were interviewed and given support and bullies were interviewed and punished. Using self-report questionnaires two years post-program implementation, a decrease in bullying was found in grade seven students and increases were reported for older students.

- m) The Schleswig-Holstein, Germany Study (Hanewinkel and Knaack, 1997)
This uncontrolled study used 10,600 students in grades 3 – 12 in 37 primary and secondary schools (3,180 primary students completed pre/post-testing; 7,420 secondary students completed pre/post-testing). Schools with age-equivalent subject groups (age cohort design with adjacent cohorts) were compared and Olweus' Bullying Prevention Program was followed. At the broad school level, increased supervision and reorganization of playgrounds were optional components. Teachers participated in a bully/victim conference day and a violence prevention training day. In the classroom, they established class rules against violence, integrated violence prevention into the curriculum, and had ongoing group discussions. Intensive discussions between staff, parents and bullies/victims took place at the individual level. Parents were also offered instructional and discussion groups on bully/victim problems. No statistically significant reductions in victimization or bullying were reported two years following the intervention, although decreases in frequency were reported.
- n) The 1999 – 2001 Peaceful Schools Study, Topeka, Kansas, U.S.A. (Tremlow et al., 2001)
This controlled study with non-random group assignment used two matched primary school pairs, including 542 students in grades one – five (intervention = 235, control = 307). School components included school-wide posters and positive reinforcement for not fighting, and a 'gentle warrior' program. Teachers were encouraged to participate to the greatest extent possible. Parents were actively engaged through the provision of bully/victim information and workshops on family power struggles. In the classroom, there were bully, victim and bystander discussions and high school peer mentors were used. Post-testing for student victimization self-reports occurred two years after completion. Teacher ratings took place 12 weeks following the intervention. Program effects were not statistically significant, although the authors reported significant increases in academic achievement for students, dramatic decline in discipline referrals, teachers reporting less victimization, and increased student empathy for victims.

- o) The South Carolina, U.S.A. Study (Melton et al., 1998)
 This controlled study with random group assignment used 6,388 grade four – eight students in six matched pairs of school districts (control and intervention groups were equal). Eleven intervention and 28 control schools were used in the first year of the study. Olweus' Bullying Prevention Program was followed. At the broad school level, intervention schools implemented a violence prevention program based upon increased supervision, bullying rules, pro-social reinforcement, and violence prevention committees. In the classroom, teachers incorporated into the curriculum violence prevention lesson plans, bullying videos, role-plays and activities, and weekly discussions. Parents were engaged through the provision of bullying and program pamphlets, parent-teacher events, and meetings with parents of victims. Bullies were punished, victims were protected and offered social skills training, and chronic victims and bullies were referred for counseling to school counselors. At seven-month follow-up, there were relative reductions in self-reported bullying, delinquency, vandalism, school misbehaviour and punishment for school-related misbehaviour for intervention schools ($Z=6.75$ average for intervention school self-reported victimization).²⁹
- p) The Florence, Italy Study (Ciucci and Smorti, 1998)
 In this controlled study with random group assignment, six matched middle school pairs were used including 487 students in grades one – three (intervention group = 243, control group = 244). At the broader school level, policies on bullying were developed. There were open meetings with parents, and teachers were offered training workshops on the implementation of group problem-solving techniques in the classroom. Videotaping supported class dialogue on problem solving. Results were disappointing. Post-testing completed at ten months in each of the three school years produced non-significant program effects in levels of self-reported bullying and victimization. In fact, significant negative results were reported by students regarding teacher intervention in bullying episodes.

3.2.3 The Canadian Experience

Canada remains far behind the demonstrated successes of other countries in the rigorous evaluation of anti-bullying programs and systematic implementation of evidence-based interventions. Instead, the Canadian experience largely consists of a hodge-podge of 'safe-school' programs. Standards for anti-bullying program effectiveness are only now being developed. Debra Pepler and her colleagues conducted an evaluation of Olweus' program in four Toronto primary schools ($N = 898$) with students aged 8 – 14 years. The program components were at the school, classroom, parent, and individual levels. At the school level, there was policy development, increased supervision, and playground improvement. Teacher training was provided in the form of bully/victim conferences, and teachers were encouraged in the classroom to use learning circles, mentoring, and work on bully/victim learning themes. Students were trained to intervene in bullying incidents. Serious talks were held with bullies and their parents, victims were supported and taught social skills, and victim's parents were taught to support their child.

Pepler used a student questionnaire pre-intervention and 18 months post-intervention. No control groups were used. Although they found small reductions in the reported rate of victimization over the preceding five days, elevated rates of bullying others more than once or twice per term were also discovered. The authors argue that peer intervention, when it takes place, is effective in stopping bullying: bullying ceased within ten seconds in 57% of cases in the Toronto study. However, peers only intervened in a small minority of incidents. There was no significant increase in students' reports of peers almost always intervening at any of the schools; instead, these rates decreased at each school. David Smith and his colleagues transformed percentages and scores reported by Pepler and colleagues into Z-scores (non-significant program effects $Z < 1.96$). They reported negative Z values (results opposite to expected direction) for self-reported bullying (-2.32) and teacher intervention (-3.66). A positive Z-score of 2.62 was found for self-reported victimization.

In another Canadian study, Leila Rahey and Wendy Craig conducted a controlled study with non-random group assignment in two schools with students in kindergarten – grade eight. In the intervention school (N = 273), elements consisted of a school day conference, improved supervision, and educational training and regular feedback for teachers. The intervention was consistently monitored to ensure integrity. At the classroom level, teachers engaged students to develop rules and facilitated weekly discussions about bully/victim problems, diversity, peaceful conflict resolution, friendship, and development of empathy skills. Peer mediators were trained to intervene in conflicts between students during recess. At the individual level, persistent bullies and frequently victimized students were provided with counseling, social skill development, listening and empathy training on a weekly basis. The control group consisted of 257 students. Measures included pre/post (four months) tests. The authors reported a significant reduction in the severity of victimization for students in grades three – eight, yet a significant increase in severity for students in grades kindergarten – two.

4. CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY METHODOLOGY

4.1 Survey Instruments

A number of methods were used to inform the survey tools. Relevant studies were identified through PsychLit, ERIC, Criminal Justice Abstracts, Violence and Abuse Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts and bibliographic databases. Recent reviews of evidence-based crime prevention in schools were examined,³⁰ and major studies on school-based anti-bullying and harassment programs were reviewed.³¹ Finally, interviews were conducted with Canadian experts in academia and anti-bullying intervention programs.

Based upon this work, it was decided to modify existing self-report tools for students and school administrators, and develop new tools for parents and school staff. The latter two surveys, although never utilized previously, were based upon the same instruments upon which the student and administrator surveys were founded.

- Two student surveys were developed (CPHA Safe School Survey for Grades 4 – 7; CPHA Safe School Survey for Grades 8 – 12),³² based upon the West Vancouver School District’s Safe School Surveys³³ and the WHO Health Behaviour in School-aged Children survey questions relating to school culture and bullying.³⁴ The key difference between the grades four – seven and grades eight – twelve surveys is in the length (the younger survey is shorter) and the manner in which sexual harassment and racial discrimination are explored. The definitions, response scales and procedures are identical for both surveys, thereby permitting a merging of the two data sets on most questions. The added length of the older survey is due to additional questions on the multidimensional nature of sexual harassment and racial discrimination. The WHO questions have been utilized with hundreds of thousands of students across the world, and the West Vancouver surveys with approximately 4,000 students. It was decided to exclude students under the grade four level due to the considerable problems around reliability and validity documented in previous investigations.
- A school administrator survey was developed (CPHA Administrator Anti-Bullying/Harassment Program Survey),³⁵ based upon David Smith and colleagues’ Anti-Bullying Program Survey³⁶ and the West Vancouver School District’s Safe School Survey.
- A parent survey was created (CPHA Safe School Survey for Parents)³⁷, based upon the same two instruments utilized for the development of the student surveys.
- A school staff survey was created (CPHA Anti-Bullying/Harassment Program Survey for Teachers/Other Adults in the School),³⁸ based upon the same surveys utilized for the development of the student and administrator surveys.

4.2 Qualitative Interviews and Narratives

A series of in-depth interviews were conducted with the seven school administrators, selected teachers at each school who acted as champions of the project, and a small number of students. These interviews took place during 2003 – 2004, both in-person and by telephone. Interviews were audiotaped and then transcribed. Additional qualitative data was gathered from written narratives provided by many students, parents, teachers and administrators on the survey forms. Approximately 300 students, 275 parents and 70 teachers provided qualitative data in this method. Data were coded and sorted by grade, gender and school into various themes. Verbatim quotes appear throughout this report.

4.3 Ethics and Consent

A research advisory committee guided the development of survey tools, methodology, and data analysis for this study.³⁹ Ethical approval was granted by the YSB Research and Ethics Committee in 2002. Due to concerns related to anonymity and safety, a rigorous set of procedures was put in place to ensure that no harm was done to participants.

Previous studies have documented how anti-bullying initiatives can do more harm than good if not delivered as intended and in the absence of a supportive school culture and committed staff team. For this reason, only those schools that demonstrated significant commitment and achievements in these areas were accepted into the project. It is important to acknowledge that the data are biased as a result of this selection process.

In order to preserve the confidentiality and address safety concerns of respondents, schools had to provide written agreement to abide by the procedures and protocols for survey administration and student follow up (see Appendix C). Included in these procedures were various options for students and parents to access school and community resources to address any needs that surfaced in the surveys. Approximately 105 students requested follow-up support from the schools, and many parents participated in information sessions held at the schools following the release of data to each individual school.

In addition, considerable staff resources were allotted by each school to ensure that students understood the key concepts (physical, verbal, social, and electronic bullying and victimization; verbal and physical sexual harassment, homophobic harassment; racial discrimination) and survey questions, and that class behaviour was appropriate during survey completion. In all instances, individual schools administered the survey to all students, at the same time, during the first two periods of a selected morning during the fall and spring data collection weeks. A minimum of two school staff were present during survey completion. The student's homeroom teacher explained the concepts, walked respondents through the survey question-by-question, and ensured that all procedures were followed correctly. A second school staff circulated amongst the students, responding to individual questions and concerns.

School administrators were provided with two options for gaining the informed consent of study participants: an active consent process, which required parental/guardian signature for their child's participation on a CPHA form (see Appendix A); or a passive consent process, whereby the school board and specific school administered the surveys as part of their ongoing safe school initiative and parents were advised by the principal to only contact the school if they did not want their child to participate (see Appendix B). The passive consent process required a letter signed by the school board superintendent and chair attesting to the fact that they had approved the research project.

4.4 Sample Selection and Characteristics

4.4.1 School Selection

Due to financial constraints, the study was only able to incorporate seven schools in the project. Efforts were made to reflect the geographic, ethno-racial, and language diversity of the Canadian student population in the study sample. As well, the project sought to capture a range of school experiences in the implementation of programs: those without any formalized anti-bullying program, those planning to implement a program, and schools where comprehensive programs had been in place for at least two years.

In January 2003, a request for candidates was sent out to school boards across the country via the Canadian Teacher's Federation and the Canadian Association of Principals. A search was also conducted for schools where whole-school anti-bullying programs had been in place for two years or more, followed up with 50 interviews with Canadian experts in the field. Schools were selected based upon the following criteria: level of administrator, staff and parent support for the project; capacity to address the needs of victims, perpetrators and other individuals in the school community; written approval of school superintendent and chair of school board; and commitment of administrators to follow the ethical and methodological protocols of the study. Individual interviews were conducted with administrators and teacher representatives of each school that passed an initial screening by CPHA.

Three schools were in small-size cities with 25,000 – 50,000 residents, two schools were in larger cities with 600,000 or more residents, one school was in a rural community with under 1,500 residents, and one school was located in a small town with just under 25,000 residents. The schools are located in Manitoba, Quebec, British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Ontario. Three sites had been running a school-wide anti-bullying program for one year or more; three schools were developing a program; and one school did not have any anti-bullying program components in place.

4.4.2 Sample Recruitment and Participation Rates

Student, parent, teacher and administrator participation rates were high in both waves of data collection. Eighty-two percent of all enrolled students participated in the fall 2003 survey, and 86% participated in the spring 2004 survey. The student data for each of the seven schools are considered to be representative for each respective school.⁴⁰ The

participation rate of parents was approximately 35% in 2003 and 27% in 2004.⁴¹ In the fall 2003 survey, 75% of teachers completed surveys across schools. Rates ranged from 40% - 94%. The overall teacher return rate dropped to 64% in spring 2004.

4.4.3 Sample characteristics

The combined sample for fall 2003 data collection was 2,806 individuals. Participants included 735 grades four – seven students; 1,230 grades eight – twelve students; 687 parents (coded to match their child’s survey); 137 school staff; and seven school principals. Approximately one-third of the student participants had a parent who completed a survey and roughly one-half of the student participants were coded in order to complete a comparative analysis between the two periods of data collection.⁴²

The combined sample for the spring 2004 wave of data collection was 2,755 individuals. Sample characteristics were almost identical in the spring 2004 collection of data. A total of 2,076 students participated: 734 students completed the younger survey (377 boys, 357 girls) and 1,342 students took part in the older survey (669 boys, 673 girls). Although fewer parents participated in the second cycle (562 were matched to their child’s survey), their characteristics mirrored the participants in the fall survey. Slightly fewer school staff completed spring survey (117).

Students: Gender, grade distribution and ethno-racial origins for the two cycles of data collection were virtually identical. In both waves, student samples had an equal number of boys and girls. The participation rate was consistent across grades, although just over one-half (51%) were in grades seven and eight.⁴³ Eight-eight percent reported that they had lived in Canada for all their life, and 12% said that it was difficult for them to read and write in English. Seventy-nine percent indicated that English was the first language they had learned to speak and 9% cited French. The sample was reflective of the ethno-racial origins of the Canadian population. In both waves, 56% identified as Caucasian, 15% reported that they were of mixed race (primarily African-Caucasian, Latino-Caucasian, and Asian-Caucasian) and 17% said that they belonged to another racial group (predominantly South Asian, Asian, Latin American and African/Caribbean). Twelve percent identified as First Nations, Inuit or Métis. The sample was representative of the sexual orientation status of Canadian youth in the general population: 3% identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual; 4% reported that they were questioning their orientation; and 93% said they were heterosexual.

Parents: The characteristics of parents in both waves were consistent. Seventy-nine percent were mothers, 18% fathers, and 3% reported that they were another guardian. Almost all reported that they read and wrote easily in English, and 81% stated that they had lived in Canada for all their life. Seventy-seven percent identified as Caucasian, 15% said they were an ethnic or racial minority (predominantly South Asian, Asian, Latin American and African/Caribbean) and 8% reported that they were First Nations, Inuit or Métis.

Teachers: The characteristics of school staff over both waves were consistent as well. Eighty-eight percent were teachers or educational assistants, six percent indicated that they were a guidance counselor, social worker, behavioural technician, and seven percent fit in the category of 'other' (administrative assistant, noon hour monitor, bus driver, etc). Fourteen percent reported that they had been at their school for less than twelve months, 26% said that they had been at the school between one-two years, and 60% indicated that they had been at their school for three years or more. The gender composition in both waves was 65% female and 35 % male.

5. CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY FINDINGS

Chi Square and Cramer's Phi (measure of the strength of association; values range from 0 to 1, with higher values representing stronger associations)⁴⁴ tests were run to determine criteria for statistical significance and strength of association between variables such as gender, grade level, school inclusion, and victimization by and/or perpetration of bullying, sexual harassment and racial discrimination. Kappa tests were run on coded parental and child reports to determine the proportion of agreements after chance was excluded.

5.1 Perceptions of School Safety

“Because we have tried to “correct” bullying from multiple angles, staff is very frustrated at lack of improvement - all starting to give up. This is a dangerous situation.”
(Female high school teacher)

In fall 2003, 81% of the *students* reported that they often or always felt safe at school, 13% said that they felt safe sometimes, and five percent indicated that they never or hardly ever felt safe at school. There were no gender differences here. Approximately equal proportions of students responded in this manner to questions on safety on the way to and from school, and safety in their neighbourhood/community. These data are comparable to other Canadian studies.⁴⁵ Student-reported feelings of safety did not change in spring 2004.

Parents rated their child's safety at school, on the way to and from school, and in their neighbourhood/community higher: in fall 2003, approximately 88% of parents said that their child was often or always safe, nine percent reported that their child felt safe sometimes, and three percent said that their child felt never or hardly ever safe in these settings. Parental perceptions of their child's safety did not change in spring 2004. However, interesting differences in parental perceptions of safety are evident between schools. For example, in spring 2004, only 76% of 147 parents in school five reported that their child felt often or always safe at school, compared to 94% of 80 parents in school two. During this same period of time, 58% of parents in school five said that they were concerned that their child might be physically attacked or hurt by student/s, whereas only 39% of school two parents shared this concern.

Teacher responses related to safety did not change in the two surveys. Approximately 75% of teachers reported that bullying was a serious problem among students at their school, 42% said racial discrimination was a serious problem, and 50% indicated that sexual harassment was a serious problem. Just under two-thirds (64%) said that these problems were no greater at their school compared to other schools in Canada. A minority of teachers said that the amount of time and resources committed in their school was sufficient to effectively deal with these problems (42%). A large majority of teachers reported that they felt safe in their school in both surveys (86%).

5.2 Rates of Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination

The student-reported prevalence rates are comparable to other major studies in Canada and elsewhere.⁴⁶ Both weekly and monthly rates are presented here.

5.2.1 Overall Bullying:

In 2003, 27% of 1799 students (481 students) did not bully and also were not bullied over the four-week period. Thirty nine percent (697) were bully-victims, 22% (394) were victims only, and 13% (227) were bullies only. The data suggest that there is a positive and strong association for the relationship between victimization and bullying ($X^2 = 172.8$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.3111).

5.2.2 Physical Bullying:

“She is often hit by boys. They pretend that they are just joking. Three times she has been smacked across the face, once with an object, twice with an open hand. The child’s parent does nothing and think it is okay. She has also been pushed around and tripped. Most of this happens within the school hours.” (Mother of grade seven girl)

In 2003, 69% of 1793 students (1244 students) did not bully and also were not bullied physically. Therefore, 32% were victimized and/or engaged in physical bullying once or more during the four-week period: 13% (233) were bullied but did not take part in bullying others; 9% (167) bullied others but were not bullied themselves; and 8% (149) were bullied and they also bullied others. The data suggest that there is a positive and strong association between being a victim and perpetrator of physical bullying ($X^2 = 150.99$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.292).

Three percent of the students reported victimization by physical bullying weekly, and boys were significantly more likely to be victimized than girls ($X^2 = 8.62$, $p < 0.0033$; Cramer's Phi = 0.0693). Boys and girls were equally likely to have reported that they engaged in physically bullying others every week (2%).

5.2.3 Verbal Bullying:

In 2003, 39% of 1813 students (703) did not bully and also were not bullied verbally. Therefore, 61% (1110 students) were victimized and/or engaged in verbal bullying once or more during the four-week period. Twenty-eight percent (502) were bullied and they also bullied others, 20% (366) were victims only, and 13% (242) were bullies only. The data suggest that there is a positive association between victimization and bullying in this area ($X^2 = 192.85$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.3273).

Twelve percent of students (230) reported weekly victimization by verbal bullying; boys were equally likely to be victimized compared to girls. Six percent (114) admitted to bullying others verbally every week (there were no gender differences).

5.2.4 Social Bullying:

“I find that even today you still find gym teachers who allowed team captains to pick their teams. This always leaves the less athletic kids to the end. Teachers need to be aware of how devastating this can be to a student and is in my opinion a form of bullying. Teachers should pick the teams.” (Father of grade eleven boy).

In 2003, 59% of 1752 students (1032 students) did not bully nor were they bullied socially in the 4-week period. Therefore, 41% (720 students) were victims and/or bullies. Twenty percent (356) were victims only, 11% (185) were bullies only, and 10% (179) were bully-victims. There was a positive association between victimization and bullying in this area ($X^2 = 74.15$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.2072$). Seven percent of students said that they were victimized by social bullying weekly, and two percent reported that they bullied other students socially every week. There were no significant gender differences.

5.2.5 Electronic Bullying:

Eighty-seven percent of 1795 students (1554 students) did not bully nor were they bullied electronically in 2003. Therefore, 13% (241 students) were victims and/or bullies. Five percent (93) were victims only, 3% (60) were bully-victims, and 5% (88) were bullies only. There is a positive association between victimization and bullying here ($X^2 = 207.61$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s $\Phi = 0.3437$). Two percent of all students said that they were electronically bullied weekly and two percent admitted to bullying others electronically every week. There were no gender differences.

5.2.6 Rates by Grade:

Student-reported physical bullying rates for the 4-week period in fall 2003 were highest for grades four – seven (68% of these students were in grade seven), whereas the rates for electronic and social bullying were highest in grades eight – twelve (88% were in grades 8 – 10). These findings are consistent with data from other studies,⁴⁷ although this is the first Canadian study to report on electronic bullying in schools. Despite a reduction in monthly bullying rates in 2004, these grade patterns persisted.

Although no statistically significant relationship was found between grade and self-reported bullying behaviour, being in grades four – seven was positively associated with being a victim only ($X^2 = 47.63$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s $\Phi = 0.1573$).⁴⁸ There were no statistically significant differences between the younger and older students regarding those who were bullies only (roughly 10%) or bully-victims (roughly 9%).

Although only a small minority of students reported being involved in electronic bullying, a disproportionate number were in grades 8 – 12. Whereas 17% of the older group reported involvement (189 of 1124 students), eight percent of the younger group were involved (52 of 671 students). A positive but weak association was found between grade and this form of bullying ($X^2 = 28.93$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s $\Phi = 0.1287$). For the

older group, seven percent were victims-only, six percent were bullies-only, and four percent were bully-victims.

There were no statistically significant differences in the weekly prevalence data between grades. For physical bullying, approximately four percent reported weekly victimization and two percent reported weekly perpetration. No gender differences were evident. For verbal bullying, 13% in both groups reported weekly victimization. There were no statistically significant gender differences.

5.2.7 Rates by Gender:

“I don’t know, you can’t really reduce or prevent bullying because no matter how much you punish the bullie he can’t stop because when the bully bullies it makes him feel good it makes him feel powerful.” (Grade seven girl)

Gender differences are evident in the areas of engagement in and victimization by physical and social bullying. Overall, boys (26%) were more likely to report being victimized by physical bullying compared to girls (16%). A positive association was found here for the fall sample ($X^2 = 29.76$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.1282). There was a statistically significant association between being male and self-reported physical bullying ($X^2 = 21.29$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.1085).

In both waves of data collection, boys were twice as likely as girls to report that it didn’t bother them when students got bullied (49% of boys compared to 24% of girls), and that they didn’t want bullying to stop (39% versus 19% of girls). There was a positive association between being female and being bothered by bullying ($X^2 = 134.01$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.2634), and wanting an incident of bullying to stop ($X^2 = 89.15$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.2152). A grade 10 boy’s narrative is illustrative: *“I don’t know don’t really care either as far as I’m concerned if you are a victim pick up some weight build yourself and go beat them up after.”*

Being male was associated with victimization by physical bullying in grades four – seven ($X^2 = 12.84$, $p < 0.0003$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.1416), but no significant gender differences were evident in the older grades. The only significant association in the older grades was between being female and reported victimization by social bullying ($X^2 = 20.63$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer’s Phi = 0.1349).

5.2.8 Sexual Harassment:

“The school year has only been in progress for 2 months. She has already been a target for gossip, had spit balls bombard her in the hallways, harrassed in class to the point of having to change seats twice resulting in her having fear of failing the class because she couldn’t concentrate on her work, had gum stuck all over the face of her lock on her locker, and the latest attack her locker was broken into, a dead fish was put inside her locker, when she came back from reporting the incident to administration she was faced with a group of boys destroying her personal property.” (Mother of grade nine girl)

Only students in grades 8 – 12 were surveyed on sexual harassment. Reductions occurred in most schools for monthly verbal and physical harassment in 2004; however, weekly rates did not change. Forced sexual contact rates did not change in the second wave of data collection.

In 2003, seven percent of all students reported that someone at school had made an unwelcome or crude comment about their body weekly (there were no gender differences). Of the victims, 55% said that boy(s) had done this to them, and 25% said that girl(s) were responsible.

Twenty-eight percent of 1185 students reported that they had been touched, grabbed or pinched in a sexual way at school at least once in the 4-week period. Of these 317 students, 61% said it happened monthly, and 39% said that it had happened weekly. Five percent said that they had been forced to do something sexual (not including kissing) at school once or more during the four weeks (there were no significant gender differences). Girls and boys were equally likely to report that the other gender was the perpetrator. A grade twelve girl who reported being the victim of unwanted sexual contact wrote the following words on her survey: *“I think the biggest problem for me is sexual degradation. I wear sweaters and big clothes still the guys stare in an unrespectful/sexual manner. Persona I find it degrading and I think most men need to be taught respect.”*

Of these students who reported having been sexually harassed *physically*, 72% (227) reported that they had taken part in bullying other students during this same period of time. However, there was no statistically significant relationship here.⁴⁹ Of these 227 students, verbal bullying was the most prevalent form reported (85%), followed by social and physical (both 44%), and electronic (26%). Further analysis is required to determine what role gender plays here. It is likely that the dynamics are very complicated here, and that certain forms of harassment are bi-directional in nature.

Of the 317 victims of unwanted touching/grabbing/pinching, 54% reported that a boy or boys committed the harassment, 37% said it was done by a girl or girls, and 9% said that boy(s) and girl(s) were responsible. There was a very strong association between gender and sexual harassment ($X^2 = 167.61$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.7425). Further cross-tabulation by gender indicates that of the boys, 12% said that other boys were responsible, 84% reported that girls harassed them, and 3% reported that both boys and girls harassed them. On the other hand, 10% of girls said that other girls were responsible, 78% said that boys had harassed them in this way, and twelve percent said that both girls and boys had done this. These data are consistent with the findings of other investigations of peer-to-peer sexual harassment in Canadian⁵⁰ and American schools.⁵¹

There is a positive association between gender and level of empathy for victims of sexual harassment. While 85% of females often or always said that they wanted sexual harassment against students to stop once an incident began (when they witnessed an incident), only 60% of boys said the same ($X^2 = 96.69$, $N = 1211$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi

= 0.2844). Similarly, whereas 82% of girls reported that the sexual harassment of students bothered them some/a great deal of the time, this was true for only 52% of boys ($X^2 = 103.07$, $N = 1209$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.2938). A grade eight boy summed it up this way: "A lot of girls ask for sexual harassment by the way they dress, if they didn't want the comments they should wear clothes that cover's their bodies."

5.2.9 Homophobia:

"There is a large number of students in this school who see nothing wrong with making rude and inappropriate comments to others especially with regard to sexual orientation (calling people gay or fag). When called on it the usual comment is 'It was just a joke'."

(Female high school teacher)

Six percent of grades 8 – 12 students in both 2003 and 2004 said that they were afraid that they might be made fun of or left out because of their sexual orientation. Ten percent reported that they had been called gay, a fag, lesbian or called other things like this as an insult weekly. Whereas 14% of boys were affected, 6% of girls were victimized in this way. Tests of significance reveal a positive association between gender and homophobic harassment victimization and perpetration. Boys had a higher rate of victimization by and engagement in homophobic behaviour ($X^2 = 23.32$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1657). When asked who insulted them, 71% of boys said that other boys were responsible, whereas only 7% reported that girls harassed them in this way. On the other hand, girls indicated that boys and other girls were equally likely to have had harassed them in this way. The association between gender and perpetration was positive and moderate in strength ($X^2 = 47.7$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.4046). A grade eight boy who reported weekly victimization by homophobic harassment wrote the following words on his survey: "I have been called 'gay' and people have been saying that I am sexually attracted to guys."

In both years, approximately 25% of students said that they had been insulted in this way monthly. Roughly twice as many boys compared to girls were victimized monthly by homophobic harassment. What little Canadian research exists in this area is limited by small sample sizes. The current findings are consistent with these data⁵² and also investigations in the U.S.A.⁵³

5.2.10 Racial Discrimination:

"The (minority group) are the only one's bullying other kids so I say we send (minority group) back to their own school, I feel like they don't belong at our school with such behavior." (Grade six girl)

Only students in grades 8 – 12 were asked if they had engaged in racist behaviour. Both groups of students were asked if they had been victimized by racist behaviour. In 2003, 18% of students reported that they had called other students racist names once or more, and the same number said that they had made fun of other students' ethnic accent, and teased/made fun of other students' culture or race. There were no significant gender

differences here. Twelve percent admitted that they had treated a certain ethnic or racial group as second-rate, and 14% reported that they had said bad things or blamed a certain racial or ethnic group for problems in school or society at least once during the four-week period. A grade eight boy's words are representative: "*And I aint being rasisit but like the (minority group) think they rule everything that's why there is so much rasism.*"

Ten percent reported that they had been called racist names once or more during this period of time (13% of males, 8% of females), and 14% reported that other people had said negative things about their culture or race at least once during the four-week period. There was positive support for the association between gender and level of empathy for victims. While 82% of females often or always said that they wanted discriminatory incidents against students to stop, only 60% of boys said the same ($X^2 = 69.79$, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer's Phi = 0.2434, N = 1199). Similarly, being female was also positively associated with reporting that discrimination against students bothered oneself some/a great deal of the time.

There was inter-school variation in levels of racist behaviour and victimization. In part, this can be explained by the degree of ethno-racial diversity in each of the seven schools. In one school, 10% of students reported that they called other students racist names weekly, and just under one-third said that they did this monthly. In another school, one out of every four admitted to doing this monthly, and one of five said they were victimized by this form of racism. Although both schools had roughly equal proportions of ethno-racial minority students (50%), the latter had one primary minority group, whereas the former had greater diversity in the student population. It is interesting that almost all of the parents of these youth denied their child was involved in racist behaviour. Some of these same parents provided narratives on the surveys describing how specific ethnic and racial minorities were the cause of problems in the school. A father of a grade six girl summed it up this way: "*Get the (minority group) out of the schools because they are the biggest cause of bullying, harassmt and discrimination.*"

5.2.11 Other Discrimination (weight, body shape, ability):

"I am really sick of how other students make fun of those that are fat, ugly, dresses different or what they eat for lunch. Some students are not as fortunate as other ones. Parents often have a big affect on their children because they do have money. It is not fair." (Mother of grade seven boy)

Sixteen percent of students in 2003 reported that they had been left out or treated badly because of their weight at school once or more in the 4-week period, with girls more likely than boys to have reported this. Twenty percent of all students said that they had been left out or treated badly because of the way they looked or their body shape. This form of discrimination was positively associated with being a girl ($X^2 = 6.38$, $p < 0.0115$, Cramer's Phi = 0.075). When younger students are compared with the older students in this sample, it is evident that the largest gender differences are in grades 8 – 12. There were no changes in these rates in 2004. These data are consistent with the findings of Ian Janssen and his colleagues on a representative sample of 5,749 Canadian boys and girls

aged 11 – 16 years, where strong and significant associations were found for social, verbal and physical bullying victimization in overweight and obese children.⁵⁴

More boys than girls reported that they had been left out or treated badly because of their physical strength or weakness, although the association was not statistically significant.

5.3 Telling Others and Helping Peers

“I honestly don’t know because if we report it the princable does do something but the next day the bully is contiuly doing it. It doesn’t matter if you warn them or give them a ditendion they’ll still do it. So I don’t know what the school can do?” (Grade seven girl)

In 2003, 15% of 1,965 students who experienced bullying reported that they told an adult at school about it; 26% told a parent; and 28% reported that they told a friend. Forty-five percent said that when they *witnessed* a recent bullying incident, they told another student about it. Girls were much more likely compared to boys, no matter what age, to report having told adults and/or peers about incidents of bullying they had witnessed. Forty-three percent of boys said they ignored the last incident they saw or heard, compared to only 26% of girls. The association between being female and telling someone about the last bullying incident witnessed was statistically significant ($X^2 = 63.45$, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer’s Phi = 0.1848). Of the total sample, more girls than boys told parents, siblings, adults at school, and another student. Gender differences remained constant in 2004.

In both 2003 and 2004 surveys, approximately one-third of students reported that they didn’t intervene the last time they saw or heard another student being bullied, and one-quarter reported that they helped the person being bullied at the time of the incident. Over one-half of respondents said that the reason they didn’t do anything to intervene was because they didn’t want to get involved for such reasons as being afraid or threatened, it would not have made a difference, or it was ‘not my problem’. A grade six girl wrote, *“People are afraid they will get bullied more if they tell anyone. I don’t think we can do ANYTHING!!”* A grade eight boy said this: *“I don’t think our school can stop bullying because it’s every where the to many student that to it and the person who being bullied wont tell because he scared what the bully or bullies friend our gonna do next.”*

In both surveys, boys were more likely to report that they ignored the last incident of bullying they witnessed at school compared to girls, and to report that they only harassed students who deserved it. The following quote from a grade 10 boy is illustrative: *“Step away from it, let students keep to themselves and deal with their own problems. If the person can’t stand uyp for themselves, why should someone else?”*

5.4 Parent-Child Communication

“Well I don’t think the school can help. Maybe the reason there is so meny bully’s is because the bully’s are not loved. So it’s probably the parents falt. They don’t treet thier children right and don’t give them love.” (Grade seven girl)

Six hundred and ninety seven parent-student matches were in the 2003 sample (i.e., the family code of 687 students matched the family code of 687 parents; one parent was instructed to fill out the survey on one child). Findings related to parent – student reports were consistent across both waves of data collection. In 2003, only 25% of these parents were aware of their child’s self-reported bullying behaviour (the proportion of agreements after chance has been excluded was 17%, kappa (N = 571) = 0.169, $p < .0005$). Of the parents who had knowledge that their child was a bully, they were most likely to know about his/her physical bullying (kappa [N = 611] = 0.173, $p < .0005$) and least likely to know about his/her social bullying (kappa [N = 592] = 0.121, $p < .0005$).

Only 56% of parents said they knew about their child’s self-reported victimization during this 4-week period (the proportion of agreements after chance has been excluded was 32%, kappa (N = 616) = 0.319, $p < .0005$). Of these parents who knew that their child was victimized, they were most likely to be aware of verbal (kappa [N = 617] = 0.321, $p < .0005$) and social victimization (kappa [N = 592] = 0.257, $p < .0005$).

Parent reports of where and when bullying/harassment/ discrimination occurred did not match the reports of their children. A majority of parents said that they simply did not know where or at what time of the day their children were most at risk. For example, a top-ranked area where students reported bullying/harassment/ discrimination most often occurred in 2003 was outdoors around the school. Yet, only 17% of parents said these incidents happened most often here, and 24% reported that they did not know. By comparison, 85% of students reported that bullying most often happened outdoors. Whereas 14% of parents said that bullying happened often in hallways, 79% of students reported that it happened here often. These parents said that their child was most at risk for bullying during breaks (24%), after school and between classes (approximately 15% for both). On the contrary, students reported that bullying and harassment happened most often during breaks (89%) and after school (77%). Perhaps the most surprising difference in perceptions was in the classroom: just under 20% of parents reported that these forms of harmful behaviours happened in the class, yet 60% of students said this was a primary location for victimization.

5.5 School Inclusion

“My son is continuously teased which eventually gets him angry enough to shout or cry at the bullies which only add fuel to the fire as they continue since they know he will react. I think more has to be done at the initial stages of the teasing as it is often the beginning of the end result. As my child has also been diagnosed with ADD, I find that it is not treated as a disability but more as a reason to assume that he’s not the victim. More education should be provided to teachers and staff in this and other disabilities.” (Mother of grade seven boy)

A school inclusion index was created for the 2003 data using three questions (equally weighted) relating to student feelings of support (q. 45: In this school, I feel like I am successful; q. 60: I feel like I matter in this school; q. 65: In this school, I feel like I belong. Respondents were asked to circle one of five answers for each question: i) never

or not at all true; ii) hardly ever or not really true; iii) somewhat or sometimes true; iv) often or most of the time true; and v) definitely or always true). Of the 1826 respondents, 38% were classified as *lacking support* (students who responded all three questions using answers i) or ii), 29% were classified as having *some support* (students who responded to all three questions as somewhat or sometimes true), and 33% were classified as supported.

There appear to be significant differences in bullying experiences between the 691 students who lacked support and 600 students who had support. Forty-one percent of students who lacked support said that they had taken part in bullying in the four-week period compared to only 29% of students with support. Lacking support was positively associated with being a bully ($X^2 = 10.78$, $p < 0.001$; Cramer's $V = 0.0934$), although much stronger associations between these variables have been reported in other studies.⁵⁵ Lacking support was also positively associated with victimization ($X^2 = 49.24$, $p < 0.001$; Cramer's $V = 0.1969$). One must be extremely cautious in the interpretation of these data. It is not clear what these differences mean. For example, were the students identified as lacking support trying to get power by bullying? Or were these students who did not feel connected to anything at school?

Schools that had the highest rates of participation by students in structured outside-of-class activities had the lowest rates of student problems, irrespective of whether or not a formalized anti-bullying program had been implemented. Although one cannot imply causality here, it seems that providing the vast majority of students with meaningful opportunities for engagement in school life is related to healthy peer relations.

5.6 Teacher Knowledge of Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination in their School

“The teachers can get more involved, and not make the principle and VP do all the discipline, they should be active and not just ignore bullying, but stop it! Teachers should also not bully or make fun of other students, its cruel and sets a very bad example.” (Grade eight girl)

Teacher reports of where and when incidents happen did not match those of their students in both surveys. The top ranked areas where teachers reported bullying/harassment/discrimination most often occurred were: hallways (roughly 75% of respondents reported that these behaviours most often happened here; the remainder said it sometimes or rarely took place here), outdoor areas around the school (60%), and gym change rooms (roughly 50%). Just under one-half of teachers said that bullying/harassment/discrimination happened most often on the way to and from school and in the lunch/eating area in both surveys. On the contrary, students reported that bullying and harassment happened *least* before school and most often after school and during breaks. This raises the possibility that teachers may be supervising in the wrong places and at the wrong times of the day. Finally, many students reported that the classroom was a primary location for perpetration and victimization; teachers, on the other hand, said that this was just about the safest place in the school. Whereas 60% of grades 8 – 12 and 40% of grades four –

seven respondents rated the classroom as a location where bullying, harassment and discrimination most often happened, only 20% of teachers reported that this was the case.

In 2003, roughly 50% of the teacher respondents reported that they were not aware of any services in their own school to address the needs of bullies and victims, despite the fact that three of the seven schools had specific programs in place. This may be related to the fact that roughly one-third of all teachers had been working in their job for less than 12 months. In 2004, teacher knowledge of school services had risen substantially. However, 40% of teachers said they didn't know if group counseling services were available for perpetrators and victims, and 16% did not know if their school offered individual counseling.

5.7 Impact of Program Participation

“We can't really do anymore. We have plenty of programs which encourage anti-bullying, but, not many people listen or care about it.” (Grade nine girl)

There were no apparent positive effects on bullying and victimization rates for the 622 students who reported that they had participated in school-based anti-bullying programs in the 2003 surveys (frequent class discussions, school assemblies, counselling, rallies and poster campaigns). The data suggest there is no association for victimization ($X^2 = 2.11$, $p=0.1463$; Cramer's Phi = 0.0352). The effect is in the opposite direction expected for physical bullying: participation in an anti-bullying program was associated with being a bully ($X^2 = 0.03$, $p=0.8625$; Cramer's Phi = 0.0052).

Compared to the 1329 students who said that they had never participated in anti-bullying programs, the former group was more likely to report incidents, to be bothered, and to want bullying to stop. These data support previous findings from studies in Canada and elsewhere.⁵⁶ In the 2003 survey, program participation was positively associated with being often or always bothered when other students get bullied ($X^2 = 22.01$, $p=0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1074) and often or always wanting student bullying incidents to stop ($X^2 = 45.62$, $p=0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1541). Program participation was also positively associated with taking action to get help for victims: telling parents ($X^2 = 30.61$, $p=0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1266), intervening to help the victim ($X^2 = 21.81$, $p=0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1541), or getting someone to help stop the bullying ($X^2 = 35.89$, $p=0.0001$; Cramer's Phi = 0.1071). No significant differences were found between the two groups regarding actions they took the last time they were bullied or harassed. A female high school teacher wrote these comments on her survey: *“Interventions not effective – students tune out when they hear the word “bullying”. Most feel no need to intervene. Students not interested in seeking help from peer mediators.”*

A grade nine girl commented *“They've tried. Peer Mediators, (name of group). It didn't help because it pretty much classified them as “Losers” and other people picked on them.”*

These findings should be interpreted cautiously, because program fidelity measures (i.e., was the program delivered as intended?) were not systematically undertaken. As well, it is likely that schools required bullies to take part in programs to address their behaviour – meaning that there were likely more bullies amongst the program participants compared to the students who had not taken part in programs. Further, participation in these programs likely increases students' ability to identify these behaviours, resulting in increased reporting.

6. CPHA SAFE SCHOOL STUDY CONCLUSIONS

We have an undeclared public health problem in Canadian schools. Bullying, sexual harassment, racial discrimination and victimization are so prevalent that we cannot possibly reach all affected students with traditional intervention approaches. Public health policy should play a key role in anti-bullying and harassment programs. Currently, it does not. Taking a public health approach to peer relationship problems will build the capacity of parents, schools and communities. Development of capacity reduces risk factors. Long-term, whole school community programs can address the key determinants of healthy child and youth development. Health promotion is best learned and delivered when it flows from a neighbourhood infrastructure and permeates individuals' daily routines and thinking about healthy living.⁵⁷

Approximately 45% of students in the study experienced bully-victim problems, sexual harassment or racial discrimination at least once during a four-week period, including roughly 10% who were involved as perpetrators and/or victims on a weekly basis. Approximately 40% of students were not directly involved in these peer relationship problems yet were affected because they saw or heard these incidents. In other words, only 15% of the students in this study reported that they were not involved in any way in these incidents.

Most students did not intervene or get help for the victim. When asked why, students reported that they did not want to get involved, were afraid, or didn't know what to do. Only 15% of those victimized during the four weeks said that they reported the incident to an adult at school. Schools with established anti-bullying programs did not have significantly higher report rates compared to schools without programs, although students in the former schools were more likely to say that it bothered them and get help when a student was harmed. However, students who had taken part in programs were equally likely as those who had not to engage in harmful behaviour.

There appear to be large gaps in knowledge and perceptions between parents, students and teachers in the seven schools. A grade eleven girl summed it up this way: *"I think if they actually LISTEN to the students, and involve them in resolving their problem, and not always think they know best, then things would work out better. The students need to have a say in what is happening, and need to be taken seriously and not treated like they're too young to know what to do."* Very few parents of bullies reported having any knowledge of their child's harmful behaviour, and just over one-half of the victims had a parent who knew about it. In general, parents had very little understanding of when and where harmful incidents were taking place at school.

There is remarkable consistency between the fall 2003 and spring 2004 sets of data. Data are comparable to the findings from other major studies in Canada and elsewhere in the world. However, this CPHA study is unique for a number of reasons: it provides detailed information on the nature and incidence of under-studied forms of bullying, harassment and discrimination in a large sample (e.g., electronic and social bullying; sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact; racist behaviour); and for the first time in

Canada, comparison is possible between coded student, parent and teacher reports in a multi-site study.

A number of positive steps were initiated by each school in response to the data from the first round of surveys. A significant group of students at each school requested support from the school and/or community to deal with personal problems. In many of these cases, counselling was provided. Each school was provided with a complete data set for their own students, and a series of meetings took to support these schools in interpreting the data and developing plans to build capacity to address safety concerns.

The *CPHA Assessment Toolkit for Bullying, Harassment and Peer Relations at School* is a companion document to this research report. It has been designed for teachers, school administrators, and ministries of education to address some of the pressing needs identified in this study. In partnership with the Canadian Initiative for the Prevention of Bullying (National Crime Prevention Strategy), this free kit provides a standard way to measure the nature and prevalence of school peer relationship problems, standards for quality programs, and a common set of tools to assess the impact of school-based programs. From a public health perspective, it provides an overview of what works and what doesn't, foundations for best practice standards (cognitive-behavioural instruction and parent training, gender-responsiveness, cultural competency, school environment), and outlines the core school components.

7. SOURCES

- Adlaf, E. and A. Paglia (2001). *Drug Use Among Ontario Students: Findings from the OSDUS, 1977-2001*. CAMH Research Document Series No. 10. Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.
- Alsaker, F. and S. Valkanover (2001). Early diagnosis and prevention of victimization in kindergarten. In J. Juvonen and S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer Harassment in School*. New York: Guilford Press: 175-195.
- American Association of University Women. (1993). *Hostile Hallways: Bullying, Teasing and Sexual Harassment in School*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.
- American Association of University Women. (2001). *Hostile Hallways: The AAUW Survey on Sexual Harassment in America's Schools*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.
- Berman, H., A. Straatman, K. Hunt, J. Izumi, and B. MacQuarrie (2002). Sexual harassment: The unacknowledged face of violence in the lives of girls. In H. Berman and Y. Jiwani (Eds.), *In the Best Interests of the Girl Child*. London, ON: The Alliance of Five Research Centres on Violence: 15-44.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education (2003). *Satisfaction Survey: Provincial Report*.
- Catalano, R., M. Arthur, D. Hawkins, L. Berglund and J. Olson (1998). Comprehensive community-and school-based interventions to prevent anti-social behavior. In Loeber, R. and D. Farrington, (Eds.) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2004). Youth risk behavior surveillance, 2004. In *CDC Surveillance Summaries. MMWR (No. SS-2)*
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2000a). National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. *Factsheet on Dating Violence*. (available online: www.cdc.gov/ncipc/factsheets/datviol.htm#References)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2000b). Youth risk behavior surveillance, 1999. In *CDC Surveillance Summaries. MMWR (No. SS-5)*
- Ciucci, E., and A. Smorti (1998). Il fenomeno delle pretonenze nella scuola: problemi e prospettive di intervento (The phenomenon of bullying in school: Problems and prospects for intervention). *Psichiatria dell'infanzia e dell'adolescenza*, 65: 147-157.
- Boyce, W., M. Doherty, C. Fortin and D. MacKinnon (2003). *Canadian Youth, Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Study*. Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.
- Cowie H. (2000). Bystanding or standing by: gender issues in coping with bullying in English schools. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26:85-97.
- Cowie, H., P. Smith, M. Boulton and R. Laver (1994). *Co-operation in the Multi-ethnic Classroom*. London: David Fulton.
- Craig, W., K. Henderson and J. Murphy (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *International Journal of School Psychology*, 21: 5-21.
- Craig, W. and D. Pepler (2003). Identifying and targeting risk for involvement in bullying and victimization. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48: 577-582

Craig, W. and H. Yossi (2004). *Bullying and fighting: results from World Health Organization Health and Behavior Survey of school aged children. International Report for World Health Organization.*

Currie, C. (1998). *Health Behavior in School-aged Children: A WHO Cross-national Study.* Bergen: University of Bergen.

DeWit, D. et al. (2002). *Sense of School Membership: A Mediating Mechanism Linking Student Perceptions of School Culture with Academic and Behavioural Functioning (Baseline Data Report of the School Culture Project).* Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.

Dishion, T., J. McCord and F. Poulin (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist, 54:* 755-764.

Duncan, R. (1999). Peer and sibling aggression: An investigation of intra- and extra-familial bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14(8):* 871-886.

Elsea, M. and P. Smith (1998). The long-term effectiveness on anti-bullying work in primary schools. *Educational Research, 40:* 203-218.

Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health (1999). *Toward a Healthy Future: Second Report on the Health of Canadians.* Ottawa: Canadian Institute for Health Information.

Felner, R., M. Silverman and R. Adix (1991). Prevention of substance abuse and related disorders in childhood and adolescence: A developmentally based, comprehensive ecological approach. *Family and Community Health, 14(3):* 12-22.

Garofalo, R., R. Wolf, S. Kessel, J. Palfrey, and R. DuRant (1998). The association between health risk behaviours and sexual orientation among a school-based sample of adolescents. *Pediatrics, 101:* 895-902.

Glover, D., N. Cartwright and D. Gleeson (1998). *Towards Bully-Free Schools: Interventions in Action.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Gottfredson, D., D. Wilson, and S. Skroban Najaka (2002). School-based crime prevention. In L. Sherman, D. Farrington, B. Welsh and D. MacKenzie (Eds), *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention.* New York: Routledge: 56-164.

Hanewinkel, R., and R. Knaack (1997). *Mobbing: Gewaltpraevention in schulen in Schleswig-Holstein (A preventive anti-bullying program in the schools of Schleswig-Holstein).* Kiel, Germany: Gemeindeunfallversicherungsverband Schleswig-Holstein.

Hawker, D. and M. Boulton (2000). Twenty years research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41:* 441-455.

Hawkins, D., D. Pepler and W. Craig (2001). Peer interventions in playground bullying. *Social Development, 10:* 512-527.

Hawkins, D., T. Herronkohl, D. Farrington, D. Brewer, R. Catalano and T. Harachi (1998). A review of predictors of youth violence. In Loeber, R. and D. Farrington, (Eds.) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hymel, S., A. White, and I. Ishiyama (2003). *WVSD Safe School Survey.* Vancouver: West Vancouver School District.

Hyndman M., M. Thorsborne and S. Wood (1996). *Community Accountability Conferencing: Trial Report.* Brisbane: Department of Education.

Janssen, I., W. Craig, W. Boyce and W. Pickett (2004). Associations between overweight and obesity with bullying behaviors and school-aged children. *Pediatrics* 113: 1187 - 1194.

Kopels, S. and D. Dupper (1999). School-based peer sexual harassment. *Child Welfare*, LXXVIII(4): 435-460.

Kosciw, J. (2004). *The 2003 National School Climate Survey: The School-Related Experiences of Our Nation's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth*. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

Lipsey, M. and J. Derzon (1998). Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood: A synthesis of longitudinal research. In R. Loeber and D. Farrington, (Eds.) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Loeber, R. and D. Farrington (1998). Never too early, never too late: Risk factors and successful interventions for serious violent juvenile offenders. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, 7(1): 7-30.

MacMillan, H., with the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care (2000). Preventive health care, 2000 update: Prevention of child maltreatment. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 163 (11): 1451-1458.

McMahon, S., J. Washburn, E. Felix, J. Yakin and G. Childrey (2000). Violence prevention: Program effects on urban pre-school and kindergarten children. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 9: 271-281.

McMaster L, J. Connolly, D. Pepler and W. Craig (2002). Peer to peer sexual harassment among early adolescents. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14:91-105.

Melton, G. et al. (1988). *Violence Among Rural Youth. Final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*.

Menesini E, M. Eslea, P. Smith, M. Genta, E. Giannetti, A. Fonzi et al. (1997). A cross-national comparison of children's attitudes towards bully/victim problems in school. *Aggressive Behavior*, 23:245-57.

Mihalic, S., A. Fagan, K. Irwin, D. Ballard, and D. Elliott (2002). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention: Factors for Implementation Success*. Boulder, Colorado: Institute of Behavioral Science, Regents of the University of Colorado.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In D. Pepler and K. Rubin (Eds.), *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum: 411-448.

Olweus, D. (1983). Low school achievement and aggressive behavior in adolescent boys. In D. Magnusson and V. Allen (Eds.), *Human Development: An Interactional Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Olweus, D. (1993a). *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1993b) Bully/victim problems at school: Facts and effective intervention. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, 5(1): 15-22.

Olweus D. and I. Endresen (1998). The importance of sex-of-stimulus object: age trends and sex differences in empathic responsiveness. *Social Development*, 3:370-88.

Olweus, D., S. Limber and S. Mihalic (2002). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention, Book Nine: Bullying Prevention Program*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, Ontario Women's Directorate and Ministry of Education and Training (1995). *The Joke's Over: Student to Student Sexual Harassment*. Toronto, ON: OSSTF.

Ortega, R. and M. Lera (2000). The Seville Anti-Bullying in School Project. *Aggressive Behavior, 26*: 113-123.

Owens L, R. Shute and P. Slee (2000). "Guess what I just heard!" Indirect aggression among teenage girls in Australia. *Aggressive Behavior, 26*:67-83.

Pepler D., W. Craig and S. Hymel (2002). *A National Strategy on Bullying: Making Canada Safer for Children and Youth*. Ottawa: National Crime Prevention Centre, Department of Justice.

Pepler, D., W. Craig, P. O'Connell, R. Atlas and A. Charach (2003). Making a difference in bullying: Evaluation of a systemic school-based program in Canada. In P. Smith and K. Rigby (Eds), *Bullying in Schools: How Successful can Interventions Be?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pepler, D., W. Craig, S. Ziegler and A. Charach (1993). A school-based anti-bullying intervention: Preliminary evaluation. In D. Tattum (Ed.), *Understanding and Managing Bullying*. Oxford, England: Heinemann School Management: 76-91.

Pepler, D., W. Craig, S. Ziegler and A. Charach (1994). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*: 95-110.

Pikas, A. (1989). A pure concept of mobbing gives the best results for treatment. *School Psychology International, 10*:95-104.

Rigby, K. (2002). *A Meta-Evaluation of Methods and Approaches to Reducing Bullying in Pre-Schools and early Primary School in Australia*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, Crime Prevention Branch, Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department.

Rigby K. (2002). *Stop the Bullying: A Handbook for Schools*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Rigby, K. (1997). What children tell us about bullying in schools. *Children Australia, 22*(2): 28-34.

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

Rigby K. and D. Bagshaw (2001). The prevalence and hurtfulness of acts of aggression from peers experienced by Australian male and female adolescents at school. *Children Australia, 26*:36-41.

Robinson G. and B. Maines (1997). *Crying for Help: The No Blame Approach to Bullying*. Bristol (UK): Lucky Duck Publishing.

Roland, E. (1989). Bullying: The Scandinavian tradition. In D. Tattum and D. Lane (Eds.), *Bullying in Schools*. Stoke-on Trent: Trentham Books: 21-32.

Roland, E. (1993). Bullying: A developing tradition of research and management. In D. Tattum (Ed.), *Understanding and Managing Bullying*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational: 15-30.

- Roland E. and D. Galloway (2002). Classroom influences on bullying. *Educational Research*, 44:299–312.
- Salmivalli, C., A. Kaukiainen, M. Voeten, and M. Mantykorpi (2003). Targeting the group as a whole: The Finnish anti-bullying intervention. In P. Smith and K. Rigby (Eds), *Bullying in Schools: How Successful can Interventions Be?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Salmivalli, C. (2001). Combating school bullying: A theoretical framework and preliminary results of an intervention study. *Paper presented at an International Conference on Violence in Schools and Public Policies, Paris.*
- Salmivalli, C., A. Kaukiainen and K. Lagerspetz (1998). Aggression in the social relations of school-aged girls and boys. In P. Slee and K. Rigby (Eds.), *Children's Peer Relations*. London: Routledge: 60-75.
- Sanchez, E., T. Robertson, C. Lewis, B. Rosenbluth, T. Bohran and D. Casey (2001). Preventing bullying and sexual harassment in elementary schools: The Expect Respect Model. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2/3).
- Savin-Williams, R. (1994). Verbal and physical abuse as stressors in the lives of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual youths: Associations with school problems, running away, substance abuse, prostitutions, and suicide. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62: 261-269.
- Savin-Williams, R. (2001). A critique of research on sexual-minority youths. *Journal of Adolescence*, 21: 5-13.
- Sharp S, D. Thomson and T. Arora (2000). How long before it hurts ? An investigation into long-term bullying. *School Psychology International*, 21:37–46.
- Smith, D., R. Stewart, and B. Cousins (2004). Anti-bullying interventions: A survey of Ontario schools. *Canadian Association of Principals Journal*, 12(1): 9-11.
- Smith, D., B. Cousins, and R. Stewart (2003). *Anti-Bullying Program Survey*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- Smith, D., B. Schneider, P. Smith and K. Ananiadu (2003). *The effectiveness of whole-school anti-bullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research*. Unpublished paper.
- Smith, P., K. Ananiadou, and H. Cowie (2003). Interventions to reduce school bullying. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48: 591–599.
- Smith, P., J. Morita, D. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano and P. Slee (1999). *The Nature of School Bullying: A Cross-national Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Sourander, A., L. Helstela, H. Helenius, and J. Piha. (2000). Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence – A longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 24(7): 873-881.
- Sturdevant, M. and G. Remafedi (1992). Special health care needs of homosexual youth. *Adolescent Medicine*, 3: 359-371.
- Suckling A, and C. Temple (2002). *Bullying: A Whole-School Approach*. London, Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Statistics Canada (2003). *Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a Multicultural Society (89-593-XIE)*. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry.
- Totten, M. (2000). *Guys, Gangs and Girlfriend Abuse*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004a). *CPHA Safe School Survey for Students in Grades 4 – 7*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004b). *CPHA Safe School Survey for Students in Grades 8 – 12*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004c). *CPHA Safe School Survey for Parents*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004d). *CPHA Anti-Bullying/Harassment Program Survey for Teachers/Other Adults in School*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004e). *CPHA Administrator Anti-Bullying/Harassment Program Survey*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Totten, M., P. Quigley and M. Morgan (2004f). *Assessment Toolkit for Bullying, Harassment and Peer Relations at School*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association and Department of Justice Canada. www.cpha.ca
- Tremlow, S., P. Fonagy, F. Sacco, M. Giess, R. Evans and P. Ewbank (2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: A controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158(5): 808-810.
- U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (2001). *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General*.
- Volk, A., W. Craig, W. Boyce and M. King (2003). Adolescent Risk Correlates of Bullying and Different Types of Victimization. *Poster presented at the World Congress on Child and Youth Health, Vancouver, May 2003*
- Whitney, I., I. Rivers, P. Smith and S. Sharp (1994). The Sheffield Project: methodology and findings. In P. Smith and S. Sharp (Eds.), *School Bullying: Insights and Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, T., J. Connolly, D. Pepler and W. Craig (2003) Questioning and sexual minority adolescents: High school experiences of bullying, sexual harassment and physical abuse. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health* 22(2).
- Williams, T. (2002). Questioning, Gay and Bisexual High School Youth: The Contributions of Risk and Protective Processes to Emotional and Behavioural Adjustment. *Society for Research in Adolescence Biennial Conference, New Orleans*.
- World Health Organization (2004). *Young People's Health in Context. HBSC International Report from the 2001/2002 Survey*. Copenhagen: WHO
- Xie H, B. Cairns, and R. Cairns (2004). The development of aggressive behaviors among girls: Measurement issues, social functions, and differential trajectories. In D. Pepler, K. Madsen, C. Webster and K. Levene (Eds.). *The Development and Treatment of Girlhood Aggression*. Mahwah (NJ): Erlbaum.
- Young S. (1998). The support group approach to bullying in schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 14:32–9.

APPENDIX A: ACTIVE CONSENT FORM

Letter to Parents about Bullying and Harassment

Dear Parents,

The Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA) is working with schools across Canada to improve bullying and harassment programs. Because our school wants to make sure students can learn in a safe and healthy place, we were asked to be part of surveys that CPHA is doing. Students, parents and teachers in our school will fill out surveys. I strongly support the CPHA project. So do the teachers and our parents' committee. We think it is an exciting chance for us to make our school a better place.

Student Surveys

- Students at our school will fill out the survey at the beginning of October 2003 and April 2004.
- The survey will take about 60 minutes during classroom time.
- Teachers will be in charge of giving the survey to their class.
- Your child's name will NOT appear on the survey. All surveys are private and confidential.
- CPHA will provide us with the results of the survey in summary form. Our school will hold an information meeting for parents and teachers, or the school newsletter will publish the results.
- Before students fill out the survey, they must have a **Consent Form** from a parent or guardian.

If you agree to let your child complete the survey, please check the first box on the Consent Form that comes with this letter, fill in your child's name, and sign at the bottom.

If you decide that you do NOT want your child to complete the survey, check the second box, fill in your child's name and sign at the bottom.

Parent Surveys

I also strongly encourage you to complete the parent survey, even if your child will not be filling out a survey in class. The parent survey will be sent home with the students for parents to complete. Please see my letter attached to the parent survey. Students who return completed parent surveys will be entered in a draw for a prize.

There are no risks for you or your child by participating. Your child's schooling will not be influenced in any way whether or not you choose to participate. I believe the surveys will tell us more about bullying and harassment in our school.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your child's teacher.

Yours sincerely,

Principal

Consent Form for Student Survey

- I have read the information letter and I agree to let my child fill out the survey.
- I understand that students do not have to complete this survey.
- I understand that my child may refuse to complete the survey at any time. My child may also refuse to answer certain questions and may decide to stop doing the survey at any time. Teachers and school staff will NOT see the students' answers to the survey.

I allow my child to fill out the survey about bullying and harassment in the school.

(Please print your child's name) _____

I **do not** allow my child to fill out the survey about bullying and harassment in the school.

(Please print your child's name) _____

Please provide your name and signature below:

Name of Parent/Guardian
(Please Print)

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Date

Return this form to your child's teacher.

APPENDIX B: PASSIVE CONSENT LETTER TO PARENTS

Letter to Parents about Bullying and Harassment Survey

Dear Parents,

The Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA) is working with schools across Canada to improve bullying and harassment programs. Because our school wants to make sure students can learn in a safe and healthy place, we were asked to be part of surveys. We completed a first round of surveys last fall. Students, parents and teachers in our school will again fill out surveys the week of April 19, 2004. I strongly support this CPHA project, as do the teachers and our parents' committee. We think it is an exciting chance for us to make our school a better place. The Western Quebec School Board approved this project in September 2003.

Student Surveys

- Students at our school will fill out the survey during a morning class next week.
- The survey will take about 30 minutes during classroom time.
- Teachers will be in charge of giving the survey to their class.
- Your child's name will NOT appear on the survey. All surveys are private and confidential.
- CPHA will provide us with the results of the survey in summary form. Our school will hold an information meeting for parents and teachers.

If you decide that you do NOT want your child to complete the survey, please contact me.

Parent Surveys

I also strongly encourage you to complete the parent survey, which will be coming home with your child next week.

There are no risks for you or your child by participating. Your child's schooling will not be influenced in any way whether or not you choose to participate. I believe the surveys will tell us more about bullying and harassment in our school.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your child's teacher.

Yours sincerely,

Principal

APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

Thank you for participating in this national initiative with the Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA) to develop evaluation tools for anti-bullying programs. To assist you with the administration of the surveys and to ensure the credibility of the results please review and implement the following procedures.

Principal Responsibilities Before Student Survey Administration:

- Provide a master list to CPHA of students' first names and their teachers' name
- Complete the principal survey and return in a sealed envelope

1a) Teacher Information

- Designate a teacher to review and coordinate the administrative process for the surveys
- Set a date with CPHA for the administrative training with the teacher
- Consult with staff to identify a date for completing student surveys
- Identify alternative activities for students not participating in the survey
- Identify the resources and supports available for follow-up and referrals for students and parents making disclosures and requesting support
- Distribute the coded teacher and student surveys which are matched by code number and name
- Verify the student name and number with the master list
- Notify CPHA of any corrections

1b) Parent/Student Information

- Send home to parents a notice about the survey
- Inform parent's their survey will be sent home the same day students complete their survey
- Provide consent forms and surveys at parent - teacher interviews or meet-the-teacher night
- Inform parents that student names will be submitted in a draw for those returning completed parent surveys
- Recruit parent/adult volunteers for teacher assistance (one per class) to circulate in each Gr. 4-7 class during the survey
- Review with parent/adult the points listed under Teacher/Adult responsibilities
- Inform students of the upcoming student survey and entry into prize/draw for returning completed parent surveys

Principal Responsibilities After Survey Administration:

- Return surveys to CPHA by courier
- Follow-up on requests for referrals/support from students and parents
- Draw and announce the student name for the prize
- Update teachers and parents on outcome of survey and plan of action

Teacher/Adult Responsibilities Before Survey Administration:

- Participate in administrative training for the survey
- Review the responsibilities for the grade level
- Identify alternative activities for students not participating in the survey
- Identify the resources and supports available for follow-up and referrals for students and parents making disclosures and requesting support
- Recruit parent/adult helpers during survey for Grades 4-7 and those needing added assistance
- Review procedures with parent/adult helper
- Verify the student name and number with the master list
- Inform principal and CPHA of any corrections needed
- Inform students of upcoming survey and eligibility for prize/draw for returning completed parent surveys
- Send note home to parents about upcoming survey

Teacher/Adult Responsibilities Day of Survey Administration:

- **Critical** - Distribute the coded survey with the matching student name. The coding on their survey should match the coding on the envelope.
- Inform the students that their student survey and envelope is attached to a parent survey within the parent envelope. They are to take the envelope, with the parent survey within, home for a parent to fill out.
- Students complete survey in class
- Refer students not completing the survey to alternate activity such as quiet reading, homework
- Explain that the survey is confidential and anonymous
- Read aloud the instructions on page one of the survey
- Refer to responsibilities listed for the grade level
- After all the surveys have been completed, have the students all tear off the last two pages of the survey. Students are to all fill out their names on the contact sheet and check either “yes” or “no” whether they want someone to contact them. This ensures anonymity of those who would like to seek help. Students can choose whether they want to write their phone number/email etc. or not. The students are to put this contact sheet face down on their desk for the teacher to pick up. Students may keep the last page of the survey.
- Ensure that the students put their surveys in the envelope with the same code as their survey. The coding on their survey should match the coding on the envelope. The students are to seal the envelopes.
- Collect completed student surveys in sealed envelopes and the contact sheets that are face down on the student’s desks
- Provide students an opportunity to discuss the survey after it is completed using the questionnaire and writing their responses on a flipchart
- Follow-up and make referrals to student services for students and/or parents requesting help

Teacher/Adult Responsibilities After Survey Administration

- Teachers and school staff to complete teacher survey and place it in the envelope provided and seal it.
- Return sealed envelope to the office.

Gr. 4-7 Teacher/Adult Responsibilities During Administration:

- The teacher reads aloud the survey instructions and questions
- The teacher reads aloud the forms of bullying and their definitions
- The teacher reads aloud the time period being surveyed "is the past 4 weeks"
- Teachers/adults cannot identify students race and ethnicity Q 7,8,9
- The teacher reviews the question and how to respond to frequency of bullying Q21, 25, 26, 28
- The teacher reviews question and answer format for Q 31, 32: tick as many boxes
- The teacher reviews question and answer format for Q 33: tick one box only

Gr. 8-12 Teacher/Adult Responsibilities During Administration:

- Teachers cannot identify student's race and ethnicity Q 7,8,9
- The teacher reviews the various forms of bullying, discrimination and harassment on pg 5,6,8,9
- The teacher reviews the question and answer format for Q26: frequency and by whom

APPENDIX D: TABLE I: FALL 2003 DATA BY SCHOOL

Cross-school comparisons must be interpreted cautiously due to the unique setting of each school. Three sites had been running a school-wide anti-bullying program for one year+; three were developing a program; and one school did not have any anti-bullying program components in place. The ethno-racial composition of schools varied as well: school five had the highest proportion of First Nations students, followed by schools seven and three; school six was the least diverse (2/3 of students identified as Caucasian), followed by schools four and two.

TABLE I: FALL 2003 DATA

School:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
# Students	61 Gr. 4	408 Gr. 7-8	92 Gr. 9-12	543 Gr. 7-12	248 Gr. 6-8	140 Gr. 4-7	473 Gr. 7 – 12
Anti-bully Program	Yes	Starting	Starting	Yes	Yes	Starting	No
Physical Bullies							
<i>Monthly</i>	2%	14% (gr.7);	12%	13% (gr.7);	19% (gr.6-7);	15%	25% (gr.7);
<i>Weekly</i>	2%	10% (8)	1%	21% (gr.8-12)	21% (gr.8)	0%	21% (gr.8-12)
		0%; 0%		1%; 2%	3%; 0%		3%; 5%
Victim Physical Bullying							
<i>Monthly</i>	15%	31% (gr.7);	9%	32% (gr.7);	32% (gr.6-7);	27%	33% (gr.7);
<i>Weekly</i>	0%	15% (8)	4%	18% (gr.8-12)	25% (gr.8)	3%	14% (gr.8-12)
		4%; 3%		2%; 2%	8%; 6%		7%; 3%
Victim Sexual Harassment (Verbal)⁵⁸							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		26%	27%	21%	33%		29%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		4%	7%	6%	6%		9%

School:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Victim Sexual Harassment (Physical)⁵⁹							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		19%	26%	32%	31%		41%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		4%	7%	8%	8%		21%
Victim Forced Sexual Contact⁶⁰							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		6%	3%	3%	7%		8%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		1%	1%	1%	1%		5%
Victim Racism⁶¹							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>	1% 0%	5% (gr.7); 8% (gr.8)	11% 1%	6% (7); 12% (8-12)	10% (gr.6-7); 18% (gr.8)	1% 0%	6% (gr.7); 9% (gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		0%; 1%		0%; 2%	2%; 7%		3%; 5%
Called Students Racist Names							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		4% (gr.8)	14%	28% (gr.8-12)	25% (gr.8)		15% (gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		1%	6%	9%	2%		5%
Victim Homophobic Insults⁶²							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		37%	17%	36%	45%		37%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		8%	2%	11%	10%		13%
Victim Report Rate (to school)							
	12%	15% (gr.7); 13% (gr.8)	9%	18% (7); 12% (8-12)	24% (gr.6-7); 24% (gr.8)	17%	9% (gr.8-12)

School:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Participation Rate Out-of-class/ home activities							
	93%	93% (gr.7); 89% (gr.8)	79%	81% (gr.7) 77% (gr.8-12)	92% (gr.6-7); 76% (gr.8)	94%	72% (gr.7) 78% (gr.8-12)

APPENDIX E: TABLE II: SPRING 2004 DATA BY SCHOOL

Cross-school comparisons must be interpreted cautiously due to the unique setting of each school. Three sites had been running a school-wide anti-bullying program for one year+; three were developing a program; and one school did not have any anti-bullying program components in place. The ethno-racial composition of schools varied as well: school five had the highest proportion of First Nations students, followed by schools seven and three; school six was the least diverse (2/3 of students identified as Caucasian), followed by schools four and two.

	School						
School:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
# Students	68 Gr. 4	377 Gr. 7-8	249 Gr. 9-12	533 Gr. 7-10	246 Gr. 6-8	151 Gr. 4-8	452 Gr. 7 – 12
Anti-bully Program	Yes	Starting	Starting	Yes	Yes	Starting	No
Physical Bullies							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>	3%	11% (Gr.7);	12%	12% (Gr.7);	18% (Gr.6-7);	3%	17% (Gr.7);
	0%	13% (8)	6%	18% (Gr.8-12)	20% (Gr.8)	0%	15% (Gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		3%; 1%		3%; 2%	3%; 1%		2%; 3%
Victim Physical Bullying							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>	18%	22% (Gr.7);	8%	18% (Gr.7);	23% (Gr.6-7);	5%	18% (Gr.7);
	1%	13% (8)	5%	13% (Gr.8-12)	11% (Gr.8)	3%	9% (Gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		1%; 3%		5%; 1%	4%; 4%		9%; 1%
Victim Sexual Harassment (Verbal)							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		18%	21%	16%	25%	15%	16%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		5%	6%	3%	0%	0%	6%

School:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Victim Sexual Harassment (Physical)							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		15%	13%	7%	5%	10%	10%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		5%	9%	4%	5%	2%	6%
Victim Forced Sexual Contact							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		4%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		1%	4%	2%	0%	3%	2%
Victim Racism							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>	4%	2% (Gr.7);	10%	4% (7); 9%	9% (Gr.6-7);	0%	3% (Gr.7);
	0%	8% (Gr.8)	8%	(8-12)	9% (Gr.8)	0%	6% (Gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		0%; 2%		0%; 4%	2%; 2%		3%; 1%
Called Students Racist Names							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		1% (Gr.8)	4%	10% (Gr.8-12)	11% (Gr.8)	3%	3% (Gr.8-12)
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		1%	5%	1%	0%	0%	3%
Victim Homophobic Insults							
<i>Monthly Rate</i>		22%	18%	26%	35%	22%	25%
<i>Weekly Rate</i>		9%	14%	6%	12%	2%	6%
Victim Report Rate (to school)							
	15%	10% (Gr.7);	7%	13% (7); 10%	18% (Gr.6-7);	8%	5% (Gr.8-12)
		7% (gr.8)		(8-12)	9% (Gr.8)		
Participation Rate Out-of- class/Home activities							
	96%	91% (Gr.7);	78%	84% (Gr.7)	86% (Gr.6-7);	72%	74% (Gr.7)
		83% (Gr.8)		75% (Gr.8-12)	74% (Gr.8)		69% (Gr.8-12)

END NOTES

- ¹ All narratives provided by study participants are presented verbatim. No identifying information is provided to maintain anonymity.
- ² Pepler, Craig and Hymel, 2002.
- ³ See WHO, 2004.
- ⁴ Totten, Quigley and Morgan, 2004a,b,c,d,e.
- ⁵ Ibid, 2004f.
- ⁶ Hymel, White and Ishiyama, 2003.
- ⁷ Estimates of the proportion of all children who are bullied range from 15% (Sourander, Helstela, Helenius and Piha, 2000) to 25% (Duncan, 1999).
- ⁸ Craig and Yossi, 2004.
- ⁹ The OSDUS is an Ontario-wide survey of elementary (grades 7 and 8) and secondary (grades 9-OAC) school students conducted every two years by CAMH since 1977.
- ¹⁰ Adlaf and Paglia, 2001.
- ¹¹ Melton et al., 1998.
- ¹² Olweus, 1993a.
- ¹³ Rigby, 1997.
- ¹⁴ Currie, 1998.
- ¹⁵ Glover et al., 1998.
- ¹⁶ Exceptions include McMaster, Connolly, Pepler and Craig's (2002) survey and Totten's (2000) qualitative study.
- ¹⁷ WHO, 2004.
- ¹⁸ Boyce, Doherty, Fortin and MacKinnon, 2003.
- ¹⁹ CDC, 2000b.
- ²⁰ Snyder and Sickmund, 2000.
- ²¹ American Association of University Women, 2001, 1993; Kopels and Dupper, 1999; OSSTF, Ontario Women's Directorate and Ministry of Education and Training, 1995.
- ²² McMaster, Connolly, Pepler and Craig, 2002; Williams, Connolly, Pepler and Craig, 2003; Kosciw, 2004.
- ²³ The Ethnic Diversity Survey was developed by Statistics Canada, in partnership with the Department of Canadian Heritage, to provide information on the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of people in Canada and how these backgrounds relate to their lives. The survey covered topics such as ethnic or cultural ancestry and identity, family background, religion, language use, social networks, interaction with others and civic participation. The survey was conducted from April to August 2002. About 42,500 people aged 15 and over were interviewed by telephone in all provinces.
- ²⁴ US Departments of Education and Justice, 2000.
- ²⁵ Mihalic et al., 2002.
- ²⁶ As reported in Smith et al., 2003 (Alsaker and Valcanover did not report the level of statistical significance).
- ²⁷ Smith et al., 2003.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Smith et al., 2003.
- ³⁰ Gottfredson, Wilson and Skroban Najaka, 2002; Hawker and Boulton, 2000; Catalano, Arthur, Hawkins, Berglund and Olson, 1999; Lipsey and Derzon, 1999; Hawkins, Herronkohl, Farrington, Brewer, Catalano and Harachi, 1999.
- ³¹ See literature review section and Totten, Quigley, Morgan, 2004f.
- ³² Totten, Quigley and Morgan, 2004a, b.
- ³³ Hymel, White and Ishiyama, 2003.
- ³⁴ WHO, 2004.
- ³⁵ Totten, Quigley and Morgan, 2004c.
- ³⁶ Smith, Cousins and Stewart, 2003.
- ³⁷ Totten, Quigley and Morgan, 2004c.
- ³⁸ Totten, Quigley and Morgan, 2004d.

³⁹ Membership included Drs. Debra Pepler (Professor, York University Dept. Psychology) Wendy Craig (Professor, Queen's University Dept. Psychology), Shelley Hymel (Professor, University of British Columbia Dept. Psychology), and David Smith (Associate Professor, Dept. Education, University of Ottawa).

⁴⁰ In 2003, school three had a 26% student participation rate due to administrative problems and the use of an active consent process (only students with a consent form signed by a guardian were permitted to take part). These data were verified to ensure that school three responses in 2003 were comparable to the other six schools. In the second wave of data collection, school three decided to utilize a passive consent process, and 78% of all students completed the surveys.

⁴¹ Schools three and four had the lowest rates of parental participation (approximately 10% and 21% respectively) in 2003 (data were verified to ensure that responses were comparable to the other schools); rates ranged from 53% - 62% for the remaining schools. In 2004, schools three and four increased their parental participation rates to 21% and 27% respectively. The remaining schools had roughly equal parental rates (30%).

⁴² Some administrative problems occurred when teachers did not follow the coding process properly. In these instances, respondents were coded for class, grade and school only.

⁴³ Of the total student sample, 25% were in grade seven, 26% grade eight, 14% grade nine, 16% grade ten, 6% grade four, 6% grade six, and 7% were in grades eleven/twelve.

⁴⁴ For a 2X2 table, Cramer's Phi is similar to Pearson's r. Cramer's V is used for tables with additional cells.

⁴⁵ BC Ministry of Education, 2003; King et al., 1999.

⁴⁶ Craig and Yossi, 2004; King et al., 1999.

⁴⁷ For example, see Solberg and Olweus, 2003.

⁴⁸ Twenty percent of the younger students said that they were victims only, compared to nine percent of the older students.

⁴⁹ ($\chi^2 = 43.54$, $p < 0.0001$; Cramer's V = 0.1983)

⁵⁰ Boyce, Doherty, Fortin and MacKinnon, 2003; McMaster, Connolly, Pepler and Craig, 2002; OSSTF, Ontario Women's Directorate and Ministry of Education and Training 1995.

⁵¹ AAUW, 2001, 1993

⁵² Williams, Connolly, Pepler and Craig, 2003; McMaster, Connolly, Pepler and Craig, 2002.

⁵³ For example, see Kosciw, 2004.

⁵⁴ Janssen, Craig, Boyce, and Pickett, 2004.

⁵⁵ DeWit et al., 2002; King et al., 1999.

⁵⁶ Smith, Schneider, Smith and Ananiadu, 2003; Smith, Ananiadou and Cowie, 2003; Craig and Pepler, 2003.

⁵⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001; MacMillan with the Canadian Task Force on Preventative Health Care, 2000; Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1999.

⁵⁸ Defined as someone at school making an unwelcome or crude comment about respondent's body during 4-week period.

⁵⁹ Defined as someone at school touching, grabbing, or pinching respondent in sexual way during 4-week period.

⁶⁰ Defined as someone at school forcing respondent to do something sexual (except kissing) when s/he did not want to during 4-week period.

⁶¹ For grades 4-7, defined as respondent being left out or treated badly because of the colour of his/her skin. For grades 8+, defined as someone at school calling s/he racist names.

⁶² Defined as someone at school calling respondent (grades 8+) gay, fag or lesbian or saying other things like this as an insult during 4-week period.