



Intervention Strategies for Controlling Bullying in Classroom at Elementary Level

S.KHADIJA¹, Dr. Nasrullah Bacha², Ms. Uzma Khalid Ghori³

¹MS scholar, khadijakhan7755@gmail.com, Department of Education
University of Wah

²Dr. NasrullahBacha, nasr@uow.edu.pk, Department of Education
University of Wah

³ Senior lecturer, uzma.khalid@uow.edu.pk.

Department of Education

University of Wah

Email2@uow.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Bullying is a universal problem, which may directly or indirectly influences on the environment of school. Therefore there is the need to provide safe and healthy environment to the students. Teacher is a crucial part of a school who may play a vital role in school. The purpose of this study is (a) to identify the types of bullying prevailing in the elementary schools of Rawalpindi district, (b) To find the factors affecting the adoption of intervention strategies by teachers, (c) To identify the strategies adopted by the teachers for controlling bullying, (d) To explore effective intervention strategies. In this descriptive research the data were gathered through convenient sampling. The population of this study were the teachers of Rawalpindi district. And the sample size of this study was consisted on 400 teachers. Findings of this study indicated that teachers were used mixed intervention strategies according to the situation of bullying for controlling the bullying episode as well. Teachers should encourage those student who may report the bullying incident then they will be able to tackle the bullying situation as well as they will be able to teach their students that how to handle the bullying situation and also develop in them the problem solving skills, then they will be able to tackle the bullying situation by their own.

Keyword: Intervention strategies¹, bullying², mixed intervention strategies³, classroom⁴

1. INTRODUCTION

Bullying is an aggressive and unwanted behavior of a person when the person is targeted with one person or a group of person that involves the real imbalance of strength and the bully target the person who is less power than him. (Gini, 2004; Nansel et al., 2001). Bullying means when one person or a number of person targets another person with verbal or physical actions which may harm the person. (Online Etymology Dictionary). It is usually occur among school students it may vary in different forms direct or indirect bullying. Direct bullying may involves physical or verbal bullying in physical bullying a person hurt someone physically by hitting or beating someone, and verbal bullying may involve threats, hurtful things by saying or writing as well the perpetrator's intention is to humiliate the victim as well. Indirect bullying involves rumors and false information the bully spread the false information about another person (Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger,

& Lumpkin, 2014). Several studies shows that bullying may have negative impact on students (Cardoos & Hinshaw, 2011; Merrell et al., 2008). Findings shows that depression, anxiety and emotional problems were common among students due to prevalence of bullying in school (Cornell & Mehta, 2011; Lamarche et al., 2007). Many student participated, witnessed or experienced violence on a daily routine of their lives. The problem of bullying in school is not only facing in Pakistan but other developed countries are also faced this problem.

Moreover the researches shows that bullying among students in school may effects on those students who may involve in bullying it may negatively effect on their mental health and might be effect on perpetrator's behaviors which may visible in future of bullies, such as abuse and criminal activities and antisocial behavior as well as effect on their academic performance there is the need to use intervention strategies for the prevention of bullying (e.g., Cross et al., 2012; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Meter & Bauman, 2016)



However bullying may occurs in school various places may use for bullying activities, such as school buses, playground, classrooms and bathrooms. It is a complex problem which affects not only victims but the bullies as well. Bullying may badly effects on perpetrators and victims academic achievement. Moreover bullying activity not only effects on perpetrators/victims lives but also effects on those students who may not directly involve in bullying (Sekol and Farrington (2016)

Although various bullying intervention strategies may use for prevention from bullying practices. Numerous strategies may engage students in controlling bullying. Peer involvement strategy used to stop bullying through training of peers and develop in them some skills and trained to help and support other students who may victimized by perpetrators (Cowie& Wallace, 2000).

Teacher control-based strategy this strategy is used to control bullying among student (Roland &Vaaland, 2006). In this strategy teacher directly involve to control the bullying activity in student. Teacher use verbal or disciplinary sanction for the prevention of bullying activities. This intervention strategy may play significant role for controlling bullying in school (Olweus, 1993; Roland &Vaaland, 2006)

In addition teacher may use no punishment approach (e.g., restorative justice approach; Morrison, 2007). In which teacher might be use positive attitude and actions towards bullying behavior in order to stop bullying act and the prime motive is to develop them empathy and develop them sense of realization about what they have done to others that has resulted to harm the victim.

Teacher is a crucial part of a school who may maintain the discipline of school as well. Teacher may use various strategies for controlling bullying in school. 1. Maintain discipline based strategy in which the teacher may have the power of authority to control the act of bullying at the spot through showing some gesture. 2. Students support strategy in this strategy to support students individually and to talk with the perpetrator who may involve in bully behavior and emotionally support those student who may victimized by the perpetrator. 3. Collective support strategy in which to involve parent, teachers and other professional staff for controlling bullying in school (Seidel and Oertel (2017).

Reporting system intervention strategy in which to report the bullying incidents and bullying problems through which to create the awareness about bullying. Moreover this strategy is used to spread awareness and reporting the bullying incident for tackling the problem of bullying the collection of this data through different sources like report letters, drop box etc. (Suckling & Temple, 2002)

However for the prevention of bullying the very first time the famous psychologist **Dan Olweus** who initiated the bullying prevention program in which he established the program in which he introduces various steps the list of these steps are here

1. **Whole school based strategy** in which the whole school staff will be involved and training of staff and meeting with school staff, making the list of rules for the prevention from bullying, meeting with parents
2. **Classroom based meeting** in which the teacher may use daily basis meeting with

student and the aim of this is to discuss the bullying related issues with students.

3. Individual student strategy in which the teacher may guide the student who are bully the perpetrator and talking with the victim as well. And meet with the parents of involved students for preparing the intervention strategies for individual student as per their requirement.

4. Develop school community based intervention program in which to involve community for supporting and help to spread the intervention strategies in the community (Olweus& Limber, 2007, 2010.)

2. Purpose of the study

This study aims at investigating the various kind of intervention strategies applied by teachers in their classroom in order to control the bullying situation.

2.1 Research objectives

- To identify the types of bullying prevailing in the elementary schools of Rawalpindi district.
- To find the factors affecting the adoption of intervention strategies by teachers
- To identify the strategies adopted by the teachers for controlling bullying.
- To explore effective intervention strategies.

2.2 Research questions

- What are the effective bullying intervention strategies applied by teacher in school?
- What are the factors affecting on the adoption of intervention strategies by teachers?
- What is the relationship between intervention strategies and bullying?

- Does teacher's self-efficacy correlate with the intervention strategy of bullying?

3. Theoretical framework

In this study use socio-ecological theory for the concept of bullying which is introduced by Bronfenbrenner (1977). According to this theory various factors which influences on the behavior of an individual which may cause for the act of bullying. Several factors which may influences on the individual behavior as he/she perceived from their environment as from their peers group, relatives, family members, teachers, friends and so on. So the individual adopt the behavior from their social context and with the interaction of others as well. An individual involve in bullying behavior may not only because of his/her personal characteristics but also because several factors may effect on them which may resulted an act of bullying. And these behavior and characteristics consist on three interlinked systems (micro, meso and macro) the first one is micro which effect an individual include (parental environment, school , and group of peers and friends) and in the second meso-system is interlinked with the micro in which parents are involved in school activities time to time check their children activities, the third and last is macro-system is based on broader aspects (school parties, country, policies) these social context factors may effect on an individual's behavior (Szapocznik and Coats-worth 1999).

Teacher apply different strategies to control bullying in their classrooms. These strategies selection by the teachers depends on their skills and capabilities. The Bandura theory of self-efficacy better explain this selection. Self-efficacy theory was introduced by Bandura (1997). In which the individual can do a task as according to their skill or capability to do

a certain task. The person can do the task if he/she perceived the task from others and the ability to perform that task by his/her self. Moreover the people perceived or learned the things by their environment that may effect on their personality directly or indirectly as well. Self-efficacy is also depends on person's own skill if they do inspire to do a certain task so the person may able to do the task. It may involve two situations the first one is when the person have his own personal experience is to view the certain task doing by other person successfully so he may get inspired from that person or the second is when he has the ability or skill to do the task. (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy involve the confidence which may the person perceive from his environment. According to Self-efficacy theory the person know how to deal with the problematic situation whenever the person may view or face the aggressive or unwanted behavior of others (Bandura, 1986).

The purpose of all the intervention strategies is to control student's negative behavior. According to social cognitive theory (bandura 1977, 1986) in which the student may adopt the positive attitude instead of negative attitude, the student more likely to be engage in the behavior which results as rewarded than punished. Social cognitive theory refers to develop the problem solving skills and positive attitude towards bullying act. This theory suggested to involve cognitive functions to control bullying in school.

4. Methodology

This study used quantitative research design for collecting the data. In this quantitative research study the data was collected through close-ended questionnaire. In this descriptive research used cross-sectional survey. And used convenient sampling technique for the

sample of the study. And the data were gathered through online survey. Data were collected from teachers of district Rawalpindi. There are two dependent variable of bullying' direct bullying and indirect bullying were include in the questionnaire. And eight independent variables are discussed in this study' control based strategy, individual support strategy, collective cooperation strategy, no punishment strategy, against perpetration strategy, encourage student-reporting system strategy, bystander strategy, ignore bullying situation strategy are included. And one intervening variable is teacher's self-efficacy used to measure the interference between the independent variables. Bullying and intervention strategies were measured by self-developed questionnaire. The population of this study was elementary teachers of district Rawalpindi, both female and male teachers were participated.

4.1 Data collection

The data were gathered through online Google survey. The link was shared via email and through Whatsapp with targeted population. The responses were received from the audience. Then their responses were downloaded as an excel sheet. The data were collected through online questionnaire form, the questionnaire were distributed among targeted population. In the questionnaire clearly mention the purpose of the study and provide assurance to the participant that the information will be kept confidential and anonymous. And the data were analyze through SPSS software.

4.2Data analysis

The data was analyzed through SPSS software by using various statistical techniques included standard deviation, Pearson correlation, arithmetic mean, frequencies, regression independent

sample t-test, regression through which to analyzed the data.

Table 4.3: Frequency distribution on Gender of teacher

Gender of Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Female	323	67.9
Male	153	32.1
Total	476	100.0

Table 4.4 Descriptive statistics

Types of bullying

Descriptive statistics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Directbullying	476	1.00	4.25	2.3650	.59871
indirectbullying	476	1.00	4.33	2.0532	.68362
Valid N (listwise)	476				

For the direct bullying which consisted of 4 items, the score range was to 1.00 to 4.25. It produced the mean score of 2.3650 with a standard deviation of .59871. For indirect bullying which consist of 3 items, the score range was 1.00 to 4.33. It produced the mean score of 2.0532 with standard deviation of .68362.

Table 4.5 descriptive statistics Intervention strategies of controlling bullying

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Min	Ma	Mean	Std. Devia
		imu	xim		tion
Control based	476	2.00	5.00	4.0553	.67328
Student Support	476	1.00	5.00	3.6115	.71386
Collective Cooper	476	1.33	5.00	3.5231	.84863

No Punishment	476	1.33	5.00	3.8515	.82499
Against perpetration	476	1.00	5.00	3.3725	1.06133
Encourage report system	476	1.33	4.67	3.3025	.79559
Bystander Intervention	476	1.33	5.00	3.6275	.65094
Ignore Bullying	476	1.00	5.00	1.9769	.79306
Valid N (listwise)	476				

The result indicate that the control based intervention strategy which indicated that the respondent were frequently applied this intervention strategy for controlling bullying and responses were also connective, student support intervention strategy shows that teachers were mostly applied this intervention for bullying, collective intervention were applied by most of the teachers for prevention of bullying, no punishment intervention indicated that frequently used by teachers, while against perpetration and encourage reporting system were mostly applied by teachers but standard deviation use thatthe responses of the respondents were scattered. Bystander intervention were reported that teachers were frequently used this strategy and responses were also connective towards the mean score. Moreover ignore intervention strategy indicated that teachers were least use of this strategy and never ignore the bullying incident.

5. Findings

The results of the study indicated that the prevalence of bullying was dependent on the demographic variable of school socio

economic status. The lower or middle lower status school students were more likely involved in physical fights rather than upper class schools. And the elite class school students were involved in verbal or social exclusion bullying form. Moreover the findings of the study indicated that direct bullying were reported higher rate than indirect bullying. The finding of the study indicated that teachers were applied mixed intervention strategies for controlling bullying. The findings indicated that teachers were applied mixed method approach to handle the bullying situation and they develop social skills among students. And also develop problem solving skills for tackling the bullying situation by themselves.

6. Conclusion

The findings of the study indicate that student were more likely involved in physical fights the factor which may dependent on the status of the school or the status of the student. And also concluded that it may difficult for teachers to detect the relational bullying than physical or verbal bullying which may seems easily detected by teachers. (Blain-Arcaro, Smith, Cuningham, Vaillancourt, &Rimas, 2012; Costley, Sueng-Lock, &Ji-Eun, 2013). The findings of the study shows that teachers should encourage their students for reporting the bullying episodes as teacher may know about the bullying episodes and able to intervene the bullying situation. Moreover the results of the study concluded that teachers should apply multiple or mixed strategy for controlling the bullying situation. Teachers might be applied different interventions as according to the situation of bullying. Present study shows that teacher is a crucial part of a school who take action in order to handle the bullying situation. Teacher should be train

for tackling the bullying situation. And apply various kinds of intervention strategies for handling bullying. Develop social skill, problem solving skills among students for controlling bullying in school.

7. References

- [1] Gini, G. (2004). Bullying in Italian schools: An overview of intervention programmes. *School Psychology International*, 25, 106-116.
- [2] Nansel, T. J., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., &Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and associate with psychological adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285, 2094-2100.
- [3] Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A.M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and U.S. Department of Education.
- [4] Cardoos, S. L., &Hinshaw, S. P.(2011). Friendship as protection from peer victimization for girls with and without ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 39(7), 1035-1045
- [5] Merrell, K., Gueldner, B., Ross, S., &Isava, D. (2008). How effective are school bullying Intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 26-42.
- [6] Cornell, D., & Mehta, S. B. (2011). Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization. *Professional School Counseling*, 14(4), 261-270.
- [7] Lamarche, V., Brendgen, M., Boivin, M., Vitaro, F., Dionne, G., &Péruce, D.



(2007). Do friends' characteristics moderate the prospective links between peer victimization and reactive and proactive aggression? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35(4), 665-680.

[8] Cross, D., Waters, S., Pearce, N., Shaw, T., Hall, M., Erceg, E., . . . Hamilton, G. (2012). The friendly schools friendly families programme: Three-year bullying behaviour outcomes in primary school children. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 394-406.

[9] Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 311-322

[10] Meter, D. J., & Bauman, S. (2018). Moral disengagement about cyberbullying and parental monitoring: Effects on traditional bullying and victimization via cyberbullying involvement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 38(3), 303-326.

[11] Sekol, I., & Farrington, D. P. (2016). Personal characteristics of bullying victims in residential care for youth. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 8(2), 99-113.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-11-2015-0198>

[12] Cowie, H., & Wallace, P. (2000). *Peer support in action: From bystanding to standing by*. London: Sage

[13] Roland, E., & Vaaland, G. (2006). *ZERO Teacher's guide to the zero anti-bullying Programme*. Stavanger: Centre for Behavioural Research, University of Stavanger.

[14] Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school, what we know and what we can do*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

[15] Morrison, B. (2007). *Restoring safe school communities: A whole school*

response to bullying, violence and alienation. Sydney, Australia: Federation Press.

[16] Seidel, A., & Oertel, L. (2017). A categorization intervention forms and goals. In L. Bilz, W. Schubarth, I. Dudziak, S. Fischer, S. Niproschke, & J. Ulbricht (Eds.), *Gewalt und Mobbing an Schulen. Wiesich Gewalt und Mobbing entwickelthaben, wie Lehrer intervenieren und welche Kompetenz sie brauchen* (pp. 13-25). Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkardt. doi:10.1086/428763

[17] Suckling, A., & Temple, C. (2002). *Bullying: A whole-school approach*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

[18] Olweus, D. (2007a). *Olweus Bullying Questionnaire*. Center City, MN: Hazelden.

[19] Limber, S. P. (2010). Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Lessons learned from the field. In D. Espelage, & S. Swearer (Eds.). *Bullying in North American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 291-306). (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

[20] Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 513-531.

[21] Szapocznik, J., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1999). An ecodevelopmental framework for organizing the influences on drug abuse: A developmental model of risk and protection. In M. Glantz & C. R. Hartel (Eds.), *Drug abuse: Origins and interventions* (pp. 331- 366). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

[22] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.



[23] Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

[24] Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.

[25] Blain-Arcaro, C., Smith, J. D., Cuningham, C. E., Vaillancourt, T., &Rimas, H. (2012). Contextual attributes of indirect bullying situations that influence teachers' decisions to intervene. Journal of School Violence, 11, 266-245

[26] Costley, J. H. M., Sueng-Lock, H., &Ji-Eun, L. (2013). Preservice teachers' response to bullying vignettes: The effect of bullying type and gender. International Journal of Secondary Education, 1(6), 45-52.