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OVERVIEW

I am a Master of Social Work student from Carleton University who is in a joint concentration program studying Social Policy and Direct Intervention. For my final practicum, I have been working with the Western Ottawa Community Resource Center (WOCRC) to assist in the development of the Ottawa Bullying Prevention Coalition (OBPC). One of the primary projects of my practicum is this literature review.

KEY FINDINGS

- Socio-ecological approaches perceive bullying as the intersection of multiple micro, mezzo and macro causality factors that are best addressed from many simultaneous directions (Espelage, 2014, Swearer et al., 2010, Liu & Graves, 2011, Bauman & Yoon, 2014)
- Definition of bullying: “... is unwanted, aggressive behavior among school aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behavior is repeated, or has the potential to be repeated, over time. Both kids who are bullied and who bully others may have serious, lasting problems” (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.a)
- Bullying is often divided into categories of cyber bullying, direct bullying and indirect bullying for research purposes (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.a). Further defined categories are those of the bystander, victim, bully, and bully-victims (Cook et al., 2010)
- Rates of youths being cyberbullied and victimized at the same time are higher than traditional forms of bullying (Walrave & Heirman, 2011)

Prevalence Studies

- **Canadian Healthy Behaviours of School aged Children (HBSC) (2010)**
  - Most Canadian youth that are involved in bullying belong to the “Bully-Victim” group (41%), while only 22% of Canadian children report being victimized by bullying and 12% report exclusively bullying others (Craig & McCuaig Edge, 2012)
  - Sexualized bullying increases in age throughout high school, particularly for females

- **Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey (Ottawa Public Health, 2014, Boak et al., 2014)**
  - Ottawa female youths report bullying others (12.8%) more than males (9.8%)
• Youths with low socio-economic status (27%) and poor mental health (50%) also have higher rates of being bullied

• In victimization of cyber bullying, the gender gap in Ottawa (27% for females and 11% for males) is larger than it is for the rest of Ontario (23% for females and 16% for males)

- **Tell Them From Me - Ottawa Carleton District School Board (The Learning Bar, 2014)**
  • Self-reported victimization by bullying decreases steadily from 25% in grade 4 to 12% in grade 12
  • Ottawa males (17%) report being victimized by bullying less than the rest of Canada (25%). This difference also exists for females, but with a smaller gap, 16% of Ottawa females report being victimized, compared to female norms of around 20% from across Canada.
  • Ottawa students reported advocacy outside of school (average of 5.5) higher than the rest of Canada (average of 4.6). Out of school advocacy is more than twice as high as within school advocacy (2.5)
  • Parents report the primary reason their children are excluded at school is for "other reasons" (11%), appearance (6%), high or low grades (4%), or a disability (3%)

**Ottawa Youth Focus Groups**

• Sexualized and cyber bullying is common, bullying occurs most often in unsupervised areas, reporting to teachers was not supported as an appropriate intervention

• Need for after school activities, mixing up peer groups, making on-line reporting available, clear policies, staff who build relationships with students, student engagement, a designated safe space or person in every school, and regular check ins were recommended.

**Macro Systems**

• Macro systems of influence on bullying include norms, socio-economic stratification, media, and government policies

• Family affluence was found to be a protective quality towards involvement of bullying for females but not males (Currie et al., 2012)

• Children and youth who have lower socio-economic status than their peers have higher risks of bully-victim behaviours (Napultano et al., 2015)
• Large amounts of television viewing in early childhood is related to early elementary school bullying behaviours, but a larger determinant is socio-economic status which predicts both television viewing and involvement in bullying in early childhood (Verlinden et al., 2014).

• Bill 13, the Accepting School Act, was introduced by the McGuinty Government of 2012, and passed shortly after that in an effort to improve school bullying policies (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012).

• Schools are mandated to have clear policies and protocols in place, as well as a safe school committee which includes parent representatives (Ministry of Education, PPM #144).

• The Ontario Ombudsman is now (as of September, 2015) accepting school board complaints as a last resort measure for when schools and teachers fail to protect children/youth from bullying.

Organizational Policies and Programs

• In Ontario, reported barriers for schools in implementing and sustaining safe school policies are (1) resources and time, (2) strategic alignment across all schools, and (3) data collection and analysis limitations due to lack of specified training and tools (Institute for Education Leadership, 2014).

• Common tenants across successful bullying prevention programs are holism, positive school climates, peer and staff training, addressing the needs of the child who bullied and is being bullied, developing social-emotional competencies, promoting upstander behaviours, and including systematic evaluations (Ansary et al., 2015).

• Programming for youth needs to take into account developmental stages. Currently, there is inconsistency in the literature as to the efficacy of bullying prevention programs for youths (Yeager et al., 2015).

• Clear policies on bullying are more effective than curriculum focused material and social skill training (Lee, Kim & Kim, 2015).

• Programming components of emotional control and peer counselling have promising results (Lee, Kim & Kim, 2015), but consistent significant results in this area have not been ascertained (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011), perhaps due to how programming is implemented (Yeager et al., 2015).
• Student led activities and organizations that support safe and inclusive learning are supported by research and mandated by the Ministry of Education through Program Policy Memorandum 145

• More intense programs, staff parent meetings, parent training and communication, teacher training, clear and consistent disciplinary practices, and increasing playground supervision have positive effects in reducing bullying (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011)

• Qualitative studies suggest that young children bully due to acting out narratives, boredom, instrumental reasons, or reactive emotional aggression, while youths report greater amounts of verbal and indirect bullying which is sexual in nature and influenced by gender (Patton et al. 2015)

Non-recommended Practices

• Zero Tolerance policies (APA zero tolerance task force, 2008)

• Disciplinary measures which are solely punitive (Pepler & Craig, 2014, Cohen, 2002)

• Conflict resolution and peer mediation in an incident of bullying (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.b)

• Messages that bullying causes others to have acts of violence or to commit suicide (CDC, n.d.b)

• “Piece meal approaches” or “one-off” initiatives, such as a one-time assembly addressing bullying (Pepler & Craig, 2014)

• Group treatment for children who bully (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.b)

• Immediately trying to sort out the facts (CDC, n.d.)

• Advising children to avoid social media as a way of avoiding electronic bullying (Pepler & Craig, 2014)

• Ignoring adults’ bullying and relationships—these are models for children (Pepler & Craig, 2014)

• Youth engagement programs which provide token positions to a few privileged youths who speak for all youth. (Pan Canadian Consortium for School Health + the Center for Excellence in Youth Engagement, n.d.)

Parents
- A small to moderate effect is found between positive parenting (good communication, involvement, support, appropriate monitoring) and a protective buffer towards involvement in bullying as a victim or perpetrator. Negative parenting (overly or under controlling, low attachments etc...) also has a small to moderate effect of risk towards children being involved in bullying. This effect was larger in bully-victim groups (Lereya, Samara & Wolke, 2013, Craig & Pepler, 2014)
- Girls are more strongly influenced by quality of parenting than boys (Craig & Pepler, 2014)
- Parental monitoring reduces accompanied anti-social behaviours in children who bully, and later in life they experience less anti-social behaviours (Vassallo et al., 2014)
- More communication between child and parent does not equate to strong monitoring or a good quality relationship. After incidents of bullying, children whose parents conferred with other sources about their child’s actions throughout the day were less likely to bully again, while children whose parents spoke directly to them were more likely to bully again (Vassallo et al., 2014)
- Narrative family therapy and strategic/structural family therapy can serve as complimentary approaches to address bullying (Powell & Ladd, 2010)

**Peers**

- Peer influence is one of the strongest predictors for involvement in bullying (Cook et al., 2010)
- In Ontario, student led activities and organizations that support safe and inclusive learning are mandated by the Ministry of Education through Program Policy Memorandum 145.
- After bullying prevention programs, bystanders tend to intervene more often in situations of bullying. However, after programming completion, the reason for intervening was not related to a change in empathy for the victim (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012)
- Students believe pro-bullying attitudes are far more common that adult populations report (Perkins, Craig & Perkins, 2011)
- Higher levels of substance use was found to exist in both bullies and bystanders (Rivers et al., 2009)

**Individual Factors**
• Stress from bullying has been found to cause disruption to healthy childhood development, and creates a genetic disruption which can be passed down to future generations (Vaillancourt, April 21st, 2015)
• Victims often have a lower sense of wellbeing and perpetrators often have associated behavioural problems, a cumulative effect is seen in bully-victims in that they have the lowest ratings of well-being and they also have associated behavioural problems (Craig & McCuaig Edge, 2012)
• Children and youth who exclusively bully others also have pro-bullying attitudes (Williams & Guerra, 2007), high social competence (Cook et al. 2010) and perceive bullying as a tool to advance their own inter-group status (Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003, Faris & Ennett, 2012)
• Deficits in social problem solving skills which are often applied in everyday negotiation and confrontations are found to exist in victims, bullies, and bully-victim groups (Cook et al., 2010)
• Deficits in temporal sequencing and problem solving are often found in children who are victimized and this may be a consequence of the trauma imposed upon them (Vaillancourt et al., 2013).
• Victims of bullying often lack cognitive empathy, but not affective empathy, while children who bully others often lack cognitive and affective empathy (van Noorden et al., 2015)
• LGBTQ youths are at higher risk of bullying in high school than non-LGBTQ youths, and they are particularly susceptible to bullying in the physical education changing rooms, bathrooms and hallways (Taylor & Peter, 2011)
• LGBTQ students experience less bullying in schools that have clear and explicit anti-bullying policies (Taylor & Peter, 2011)
• Bullying based on weight is a serious issues which is initiated not just by peers, but also by parents and teachers (Puhl et al., 2013)
• Youth with disabilities, learning differences, and sexual/gender identity differences are more vulnerable to being bullied, and being bullied (particularly cyber bullied) increases the risk of suicide (CDC, n.d.)

Gaps in Research
• Research is focused on longitudinal studies which document the negative outcomes for children who have been involved with various types of bullying, biological studies indicating genetic
manipulations which are produced by the stress of bullying, and studies which document the amount and depth of bullying directed towards subsections of society (Zych, Ortego-Ruiz & Del Rey, 2015)

- Although socio-ecological approaches have been heavily endorsed, more research is required on how to effectively build capacity and engage multiple players in preventing and intervening in bullying.
INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a preventable tragic experience that affects hundreds of children and youth in Ottawa every day. Recent data from Ottawa Public Health (2014) indicates that annually, one quarter of youths are
bullied, and one in five are cyberbullied, with higher prevalence rates for girls. In the heat of the moment, bullying can be devastating, but later in life, children who have been bullied (McDougall & Vaillancourt, 2015), children who bully (Ttofi et al., 2014), and even those who witness bullying (Rivers et al., 2009), have higher rates of negative outcomes in a multitude of areas. It is without argument that the damage incurred from bullying is socially, morally and economically extensive, and for the betterment of society as a whole, it is in our best interest to design comprehensive and sustainable strategies that target this problematic behaviour.

**The OBPC- An inclusive approach to address bullying**

The purpose of this literature review is to provide an understanding of empirically based tools that will address the specific needs of Ottawa constituents. The OBPC aims to move beyond advice such as “talk to and support your child” and “report bullying to an adult” into practical tools, city-wide standards and hands on education platforms which will fill knowledge gaps and enhance programming. Through combining a wealth of professional expertise, with the experience of front line workers, and the input of youth and parents, their goal is to create a feasible safe-city framework which is supported by all constituents in the National Capital Region.

Planning for the OBPC began with a professional program evaluation by Jane Whynot (2012). This comprehensive review of the Western Ottawa Community Resource Center Bullying Prevention Program (WOCRC BBP) documented the BPP as being endorsed by end-users and supported by numerous informal organizational partnerships across the city. During the course of evaluation, there was an identified need for consistent and empirically based service across sectors and catchment areas. This led to the following recommendations:

1. Gather Inter-jurisdictional stakeholders to collaborate in identifying and addressing barriers within bullying prevention programming
2. Engage parents as key stakeholders in planning, developing and implementing programs
3. Offer services and information through an on-line format
4. Build capacity of stakeholders to understand and address bullying
(5) Collaborate with stakeholders to develop and implement city wide standards

Some of the tangible changes the OBPC would like to see are for the public to (1) know what to do when they are bullied (2) know what to do when others are bullied (3) be able to recognize bullying behaviours. They also identify the goal of a shift in norms on the expression of empathy, a reduction in child and youth “cliques”, for youths to be mindful of on-line behaviours, for consistent messaging to be dispersed across Ottawa, and for constituents of Ottawa to have equitable access to services. To launch the OBPC, a number of successful projects have been completed such as a well populated parent information evening and an approved Trillium foundation proposal.

The coalition objective is not to create new tools but rather to coordinate existing programs, uphold minimum standards and to create a common vision for bullying prevention and intervention. Listed below are several of the OBPC evidence based informative websites which can be used as a resource:

- CHEO- Helping Children and Youth with Bullying
- City of Ottawa
- Ottawa Police (including cyberbullying):
- Parent Lifelines of Eastern Ontario
  [http://www.pleo.on.ca/](http://www.pleo.on.ca/)
- Ottawa Carleton District School Board
  [http://www.ocdsb.ca/com/SupportingourYouth/Pages/Anti-Bullying.aspx](http://www.ocdsb.ca/com/SupportingourYouth/Pages/Anti-Bullying.aspx)
- Ottawa Catholic School Board
  [http://ocsb.ca/schools/tools/safe-schools/bullying](http://ocsb.ca/schools/tools/safe-schools/bullying)
- Prevention and intervention plan from the public French board
- Information for parents of children engaging in bullying from the Catholic French board
Information for parents of children who are “Victims” of bullying from the Catholic French board

http://www.ecolecatholique.ca/user_files/users/63/Media/numero_15.pdf
**Guiding principles and framework**

The benefit of defining a theoretical approach is that it provides a framework to establish comprehensive solutions to social problems. Current academic recommendations are widely in support of *socio-ecological approaches* (Espelage, 2014, Swearer et al., 2010, Liu & Graves, 2011, Bauman & Yoon, 2014). This perspective holds that an individual’s biological potential is only realized through receiving support from multiple environmental structures and that only through changing the surrounding structures can a fluid and sustainable shift in thinking take place (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). From this approach, bullying is understood as the intersection of multiple micro, mezzo and macro causality factors that are best addressed from multiple directions (Espelage, 2014, Swearer et al., 2010, Liu & Graves, 2011, Bauman & Yoon, 2014). Socio-ecological approaches have a number of benefits; they represent an "umbrella under which many of the other theories fit" (Bauman & Yoon, 2014, p. 254), rely on many players to establish growth, and do not lay blame on any one party.

To address socio-ecological factors, Srabstein et al. (2008) suggests a similar *public health-community model* of prevention and intervention based on three tiers. The *first tier* involves public promotion on the nature of bullying, its serious health consequences, the need to report, and ways to intervene. A *second tier* of prevention comes from widespread detection and intervention. At this level, the community is responsible for reporting bullying incidents, as part of a health code, and supporting interventions to minimize its occurrence. Possible victims and perpetrators of bullying would be followed up with for assistance and support, and standards would be established across sectors. A *third tier* is designated as tertiary prevention directed towards the small population of high risk students, in the form of safety plans and one on one interventions.

*Structural* critiques of socio-ecological approaches are that power imbalances at a systemic level are core issues which remain largely unaddressed (Carniol, 2010). Deeper roots of oppression lie in our history of colonialism, racism, sexism, and class privilege which continue today through many forms and structures. Inherent in the definition of bullying is oppression by a person of privilege over another who is deemed unequal. Polanin & Vera (2013) discuss bullying in light of these social justice principles, recommending that students be encouraged to question neo-liberal ideals which reward aggression, competition and exploitation, as these are the very beliefs which reinforce pattern of bullying behaviour.
Post structural approaches interpret bullying behaviours as legitimized by the social and moral order which rewards children when they rise in status above the rest (Herne, 2014). Bullying is a normative response to increase hegemony and social order in society through aggression, and is part of our collective subjective reality (Carniol, 2010). Post structural approaches might scrutinize the term “risk factors” for children who are being bullied, as this puts the onus for change upon the weaker party while ignoring the aggressive tendencies of the perpetrator, and the systems which are in place to reward power-over social maneuvering techniques. Additionally, by imposing categories of “risk” and “protective” factors, an over-generalized understanding is supported in which risk factors are viewed as negative traits that need to be extinguished, and protective factors are generalized across situations as being positive and preventative (Dixon et al. 2006). That being said, research on “at risk” groups allows comparisons between groups and is often used as a base argument for the creation of bridging services, leading to greater amounts of protection for vulnerable populations.

From an interpretive approach, bullying is a social phenomenon which is subjectively understood by each individual (Herne, 2014). It is a term often associated with micro-systems such as attribution, social learning and attachment theories. Of significance in these interpretations are the locus of control which children attribute to their own outcomes, the application of stereotypes and schema, and the ability of the child to form secure social connections.

**Key terms**

**Definition of Bullying.** Tackling bullying as an issue is challenging due to lack of consensus on the definition of the word. Conceptual definitions range to such an extent that it is sometimes difficult to understand the level of harm or aggression implied, and at what point to intervene. Furthermore, survey questions and results are often vulnerable to subjective interpretations of the definition, leading to less validity of measures. Therefore, in order to move forwards in the discussion of bullying, it is essential that we begin with defining what is meant by it.

The Ontario Ministry of Education has put forward the following definition of Bullying in PPM # 144.

“‘Bullying’ means aggressive and typically repeated behaviour by a pupil where,
(a) the behaviour is intended by the pupil to have the effect of, or the pupil ought to know that
the behaviour would be likely to have the effect of,

(i) causing harm, fear or distress to another individual, including physical, psychological, social
or academic harm, harm to the individual’s reputation or harm to the individual’s property, or

(ii) creating a negative environment at a school for another individual, and

(b) the behaviour occurs in a context where there is a real or perceived power imbalance
between the pupil and the individual based on factors such as size, strength, age, intelligence,
peer group power, economic status, social status, religion, ethnic origin, sexual orientation,
family circumstances, gender, gender identity, gender expression, race, disability or the
receipt of special education.’

(Ontario Ministry of Education, PPM #144, 2012)

This definition comes with a number of limitations. It is designed to weed out situations of peer conflict
and one time incidents of violence, yet in doing so it (a) excludes minor acts of violence done without
the intent to harm by multiple players which likely result in a cumulative significant harm to the
individual (b) fails to acknowledge that most relationships have power imbalances and they can be fluid
within a single interaction (c) does not take into account the level of harm imposed (d) may not apply to
cyber bullying due to distinct one-time on-line aggression (e) is long and convoluted, making it difficult
for laymen use.

Therefore, for the purpose of the literature review, we are using a definition which is clearer for most
people to understand: “Bullying is unwanted, aggressive behavior among school aged children that
involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behavior is repeated, or has the potential to be
repeated, over time. Both kids who are bullied and who bully others may have serious, lasting problems.”
(U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.a)

Much research in bullying also divides behaviours by the mode with which it is carried out (Figure 1).
Indirect and cyber bullying are accepted as more difficult forms to address, but still markedly harmful.
Dig a little deeper, and a number of debates surface on the topic of whether cyber bullying should be included in the traditional definition of bullying, or whether it should viewed as a separate category due to distinct traits, spheres of influence and long term outcomes (Zych, Ortego-Ruiz & Del Rey, 2015). For example, the requirement of imbalance of power and repetition are criteria of bullying which are rarely fully met in situations of cyber bullying. However, the link between frequency of involvement in cyberbullying and internalizing tendencies are consistent with traditional forms of bullying (Della Cioppa et al., 2015).
**Bullying Roles.** Involvement in bullying is characterized by the basic roles of Bully, Victim, Bully-Victim, and Bystander. That being said, children and youth are often involved in multiple roles that are fluid over time and across different contexts, especially when they are young (The Learning Bar, 2014a + b). Young children who exhibit behaviours of bullying may not continue this behavior in adolescence, or it may change into more covert forms (Yeager et al., 2015). Although being involved in bullying lends itself to certain predisposed characteristics and risk factors (Cook et al., 2010), as well as dangers of long term outcomes (Ttofi et al., 2014) these are generalities only. Particularly when working with children/youth it is important that labels are not internalized, self-fulfilling prophesies are not initiated, and correlation is not misunderstood for causation.

Children/youth who bully others and are bullied themselves are often the most prevalent category identified (Cook et al., 2010, Freeman et al., 2011). This trend continues into the field of cyberbullying where there is very high overlap between youths who bully others and are bullied (role of bully-victim). One study which drew upon 1,318 European youths, ages 12-18, found that both perpetrating and being the victim in acts of cyberbullying occurred so frequently that they could predict one another (Walrave & Heirman, 2011).

**Methodology**

Research for this literature review was carried out in the summer of 2015. It is broad in scope and designed to provide an overview of the many issues and trends of bullying for the purpose of building a comprehensive evidence based Safe City Framework for the City of Ottawa. Indicators of prevalence and trends in Ontario and Ottawa are taken from the primary data of the Health Behaviours of School Aged Children Survey (HBSC) from 2010, the Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey (2013), and the Tell Them from Me (TTFM) Survey (2014) from the Ottawa-Carleton School Board District (The Learning Bar, 2014). To understand effective and ineffective interventions and responses to bullying, peer reviewed academic journal are included, with a preference upon large scale meta-analysis and Canadian studies with large samples, as well as government sponsored web sites responsible for dissemination of relevant public health information.

Bullying research experiences limitations to validity because it often relies on self-reported survey methods that are subject to self-serving biases and the self-awareness levels of participants, with little exploration into participant’s understanding of definitions. Notably, the alternative of gathering
information from teachers and parents also has biases attached to it. Teachers generally report less bullying than students (Perkins, Craig, & Perkins, 2011), as do parents (The Learning Bar, TTFM Ottawa-Carleton Parent Survey, 2014c).

Qualitative research methods can serve to enrich our understanding of survey results. Patton et al. (2015) conduct a review of the contributions and benefits of qualitative research to the field of bullying. Among the benefits are that it reaches marginalized populations from an emic perspective, and brings forward issues which may not be visible to the majority. Compared to survey methods, qualitative studies have a greater capacity to delve into explaining variables within and between members of marginalized groups. For this reason we are including the focus group results (2014) from a study with Ottawa students in grades 9-11 from one local high school. These results are summarized in Appendix A.

There are very few bullying prevention programs which have “hard” evidence to support their application, from a control tested environment. Swearer et al. (2010) suggest that this is partially due to varying amounts of staff by in, skills sets in bullying prevention and intervention, and fidelity to programming. Blueprints for Healthy Youth Developments (2012-1015) is a new U.S. organization which has stringent requirements for assessing violence intervention programs. Minimum standards to be cited on the website are to have one high-quality experimental or two high-quality quasi-experimental designs demonstrating clear findings of positive impact, carefully defined goals, and sufficient resources to disseminate information to users. They also specify which programs are “Model programs”: they must have evidence from two high-quality experimental or one experimental and one quasi-experimental design of high quality, and in addition to the above criteria (positive impact, defined goals, dissemination capacity), have a sustained impact at least 12 months after the intervention ends. More than 1,300 programs have been reviewed, but less than 5% of them meet these standards. Only three bullying prevention programs have made it onto the site; Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and the Steps to Success program have met minimum requirements and hold “promising results” and the only program considered a “model program” is “Positive Action” which targets socio-emotional development in primary and middle school years (http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/programResults.php).
PREVALENCE STUDIES


The Health Behaviours in School Aged Children (HBSC) Survey (2009-2010) is a strong indicator of Ontario, Canadian and International trends in bullying. Every four years, the HBSC study accumulates data from 33 countries in collaboration with the World Health Organization. In Canada (2010) there were approximately 26,047 respondents from 436 schools. Sixty-nine schools from Ontario were included in the survey. The total sample of Ontario students was 3,691 (Freeman et al., 2011).

In Canada, as seen in Fig. 2, there has been a small drop (15% to 12%) in the number of children reporting bullying others from 2002-2010, and a small increase in the amount of children reporting being bullied (20% to 22%) during the same time period. This is part of an international trend towards declines in reported bullying which were found in around 1/3 of the countries around the world. Within this international context, Canada has remained comparatively stagnant, showing very little progress. This is particularly concerning because Canadian rates of bullying are higher than 2/3 of

*Categories of children are mutually exclusive and represent all students.

Figure 2- HBSC results (%) of Involvement of students in the three categories of bullying in 2002, 2006 and 2010. Copied from Craig & McCuaig-Edge (2012). In The Health of Canada’s Young People: a mental health focus. Eds Freeman et al. Public Health Agency of Canada, p. 170

In the Health of Canada’s Young People: a mental health focus. Eds Freeman et al. Public Health Agency of Canada, p. 170


In Canada, as seen in Fig. 2, there has been a small drop (15% to 12%) in the number of children reporting bullying others from 2002-2010, and a small increase in the amount of children reporting being bullied (20% to 22%) during the same time period. This is part of an international trend towards declines in reported bullying which were found in around 1/3 of the countries around the world. Within this international context, Canada has remained comparatively stagnant, showing very little progress. This is particularly concerning because Canadian rates of bullying are higher than 2/3 of
other countries on most bullying measures (Currie et al. 2012).

The results of this study also indicated that across Canada, and internationally, boys are involved in bullying just as much, if not more than girls (Currie et al., 2012). In Canada, boys are more often involved in physical bullying while girls are more involved in indirect bullying (Craig & McCuaig-Edge, 2012) and are targeted by sexualized bullying increasingly throughout the highschool years (Fig. 3).

*Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey (2014)*

To understand Ottawa bullying within the Ontario context, we next look at the results of the most recent (2013) Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey (OSDUHS). The sample for this study is composed of 10,272 students in grades 7 through 12 from 42 school jurisdictions (boards), 198 schools, and 671 classes across Ontario (Boak et al., 2014).

From 2008-2013 Ottawa Public Health (OPH) worked with the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) to research Ottawa students (representative sample size is between 1000 and 1300) using the same measure. In summary, youths who were female (27%), had low socio-economic status (27%) or those with poor mental health (50%) were more likely to report being bullied through traditional forms (Ottawa Public Health, 2014). Results also indicated that 36% of female participants had high or very high levels of distress and female excellent mental health was significantly low (p<.05).

In regards to cyberbullying, the prevalence gap in victimization of females to males appears particularly large (27% vs. 11% respectively). *Table 1* demonstrates the contrast in rates of reported bullying between Ottawa and Ontario. Ottawa girls report more bullying of others (12.8%) than boys (9.8%). In comparing results across time, it should be noted that from 2011 to 2013, the percentage of students reporting bullying others in Ontario dropped from 20.7 to 16.0% (Boak et al., 2014). This trend was also reflected in Ottawa, with a significant drop from 20% in 2009 to 11% in 2013 (Ottawa Public Health, 2014).
Boys 22.2 18.9 17.5 9.1 16 11
Girls 28.1 27.5 14.3 12.8 23 27

Table 1- OSDUHS (%) Bullying in Ottawa and Ontario (2013). Author’s own configuration of results drawn from Ottawa Public Health (2014), Boak et al. (2014), and Leikin, Benjamin, Ottawa Public Health, personal e-mail correspondence July 29th, 2015.

Tell Them From Me (TTFM) – Ottawa Carleton District School Board

(The Learning Bar, 2014a, b & c)

A third survey which we rely on for data is the “Tell Them from Me” (TTFM) survey, published by the Learning Bar (2014, a, b & c). This is an anonymous student and parent survey used in over 200 districts across Canada to measure school climate. It is implemented through the public school boards in Ottawa, during class time and fulfills the mandated requirements of Bill 13 of the Safe School Act. Results from Ottawa Carleton District School Board are published on line. The youth sample is drawn from 77 schools and 22,466 students (The Learning Bar, 2014b), while the elementary school sample is drawn from 13,386 students between grades 4-6 (The Learning Bar, 2014a). The parent sample is composed of 5,112 respondents (The Learning Bar, 2014c). It should be recognized that this level of transparency is above the required standards, and the data which is brought forth from this survey can be particularly useful for the advancement of bullying protection for children and youth in Ottawa.

Figure 4 is a tabulation (author’s graph) of the frequency of bullying in grades 4-12, illustrating a decline in reported bullying between elementary school and high school grades (The Learning Bar, 2014a & b).
Developmentally, there are stages when bullying is more or less likely to be reported in questionnaires. In 2012, all children registered in American schools between grades three to twelve filled out the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire, and a random sample of 2,000 students were drawn from each grade (total n=20,000 (Limber, Luxenberg & Olweus, 2014). Children in grade three reported being bullied by others 2-3 times a month (23%), far more than those in Grade 12 (8%) while children and youth who reported bullying others stayed at a constant of 5-6% over the same time frame (Fig. 5).

Figure 5 - Students who have been involved in bullying 2-3 times a month or more in the U.S. (2014).

Beyond this, Canadian studies indicate that cyber-bullying increases with age (Napoletano et al., 2015) as does sexualized bullying (Craig & McCuaig Edge, 2012). Thus, bullying may still exist but be less likely to be classified as such, or there may be more barriers to self-disclosure due to adolescent needs for privacy and to manage problematic situations autonomously.

In the TTFM survey (The Learning Bar, 2014) there were no differences in bullying victimization rates according to gender. Notably, in adolescence, Ottawa youths report less victimization than the rest of Canada, however males are reporting far less (17% vs. 25%) and females are not experiencing the same benefits (16% vs. 20%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Canadian norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females who report being bullied (gr. 4-6)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males who report being bullied (gr. 4-6)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females who report being bullied (gr. 7-12)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males who report being bullied (gr. 7-12)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2—Author’s table, data gathered from The Learning Bar, 2014a+b*

As seen in Figure 6 below, participants also reported advocacy at school as being low, and this was the same as norms across Canada. In comparison, outside of school advocacy in Ottawa was rated higher than the rest of Canada, and this was consistent across all high school grade levels. This suggests that youths may be more open to advocacy outside of the school context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Feel Safe at School</th>
<th>Average rating out of 10, Advocacy outside of school</th>
<th>Average rating out of 10, Advocacy at school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 4-6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-12</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5.5* this is slightly higher than National average which is around 4.55</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6—Author’s table, data gathered from The Learning Bar, 2014b*

Parent Survey Responses (The Learning Bar, 2014c) indicated that parents feel the primary reasons their children were excluded from school were “other reasons” (11%), appearance (6%), high or low grades (4%), or a disability (3%). Interestingly, skin colour, race, family income, and sexual orientation, language, ethnic or cultural background averaged at around 1% for each category, and aboriginal status was at an average of 0%. The most commonly cited reason for unfair treatment of children was again “other reasons” (6%), high or low grades (3%), and a disability (2%).
Ottawa Youth Focus Groups (2014)

In 2014 a focus groups of students between grades 9-11 was held in an Ottawa high school on the issue of bullying. A summary of their responses is below, and a more detailed version is attached in Appendix A. Much of the information brought forwards in this study corroborated the trends and concerns voiced in the wider literature. Listed below are the key findings:

- Bullying occurs in areas with less supervision, and unstructured time (cafeteria, school dances).
- It exist between students with different levels of status and power - older to younger, more to less popular, better looking to worse looking, or due to grades discriminations.
- Cyber bullying was frequent, along with indirect and covert forms of aggression such as "bumping" into someone on purpose.
- Multiple reasons were given as to why females have more challenges associated with bullying. Among them were greater exposure to indirect bullying which is difficult to address, covert sexism which is displayed in media and language from teachers, sexualized bullying is targeted towards girls, females tend to be more vulnerable to criticism of body image and societal expectations, and there are more negative words to describe girls who aren’t fitting in.
- Reporting to teachers was largely seen as ineffective, and puts the targeted student at further risk of future bullying. It was questionable whether and how teachers would respond. Students also didn’t want to face the person who was bullying them, and who they reported on.
- Bullying prevention policies were not well understood, and students felt there was inconsistency in how they were carried out.

Youth programming suggestions to reduce bullying:

- Youths reported changing classes and being with different people as assisting in positive school climates.
● Staff who built relationships with students, and modeled trusting inclusive relationships helped to reduce bullying

● An on-line bullying mechanism, which was easily accessible, would open pathways for vulnerable students to report

● Encouraging music, arts, leadership camps, recreational and sports programs were seen as assisting to build positive school climates.

● One time assemblies and posters were considered ineffective.

● Programs which built communication, getting parents involved, guidance counselor check-ins, peer mentoring (carefully selected) and support groups for vulnerable youths were well received

● A designated safe space and person within every school

SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL FACTORS

Macro System

Macro levels of influence are considered the blue print for social structures and activities that occur at the micro and mezzo levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1977).

Norms

Surveys and questionnaires were filled out by 2,293 in Colorado to determine normative beliefs and attitudes towards bullying and cyber bullying (Williams & Guerra, 2007). Students (Grades 5, 8 and 11) who bully others had a high rates of perceiving their friends as lacking in positive qualities such as honesty, kindness or empathy. They perceived youth norms as endorsing bullying behaviours, and were more likely to hold pro-bullying attitudes.

Inherent in our definition of bullying, is that those who bully have more power than those who are victimized. Thus, individuals who are normatively regarded in our society as being "weak" or “ill” are at far greater risk of being bullied, and those that have more power have the capacity to bully those with less. To this effect, pro-bullying attitudes and explanations are often used to shift blame away from the perpetrator and onto the victim instead (Thornberg, 2015)

Socio-economic stratification
Research by Verlinden et al. (2014) in the Netherlands combined data from a “Generation R” study which contained a large cohort of data on infants and their Mothers (including tv watching), with follow up data from early elementary school teacher questionnaires on bullying (n=3,423) and self and peer report (n=1,176) of bullying behaviours. In a univariate analysis, they found a correlations between high tv viewing in early childhood and being involved in bullying at school. However, once they controlled for the maternal age, education and income, these results were no longer evident. Basically, socio-economic status was an underlying factor in this sample that predicted both bullying behaviours and television viewing habits.

The association between relative deprivation and bully-victim status was also found in Canada. HSBC 2010 data found a gendered difference in the benefits of family affluence. High levels of family affluence was a protective factor for girls being victimized and bullying others, but not for boys (Currie et al., 2012). Napoletano et al. (2015) combined HSBC (2010) data with Canadian censes data to research relative deprivation, and they found a high association between youth within the bully-victim role and those who experience relative deprivation to their peers.

**Ministry of Education & school boards**

At a Federal level, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the majority of bullying behaviours under a protected freedom of opinion or expression, and in most cases child/youth bullying is not considered a criminal offense. It is not surprising that we have diverse norms on the acceptable level of aggression in society, as this is reflected in our government policies as well as our media narratives. The Ministry of Education has addressed bullying through policies as they have a heightened responsibility towards moral education and the protection and support of children/youth in their charge. Bill 13, the Accepting School Act, was introduced by the McGuinty Government of 2012, and passed shortly after that in an effort to improve school bullying policies (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012). Areas of recommendation were to develop a bullying prevention and intervention plan with the school community and make it available to the public, investigate any reported incident of bullying, provide supports for students who have been bullied, who have witnessed bullying and who have engaged in bullying, support student led initiatives for safe and inclusive schools, have a process in place to inform parents of school bullying incidents involving their children and to discuss the supports available, and support students who want to lead activities that promote understanding, acceptance
and respect for all. Listed below is a list (with hyperlinks attached) of relevant Policy Program Memorandums, but the Ministry of Public Education, that relate to bullying.

PPM 120: REPORTING VIOLENT INCIDENTS TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
PPM 128: PROVINCIAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND SCHOOL BOARD CODE OF CONDUCT
PPM 141: SCHOOL BOARD PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS ON LONG TERM SUSPENSION
PPM 144: BULLYING PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION
PPM 145: PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE AND PROMOTING POSITIVE STUDENT BEHAVIOUR.
PPM 149: PROTOCOL FOR PARTNERSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES BY REGULATED HEALTH PROFESSIONALS, REGULATED SOCIAL SERVICE PROFESSIONALS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS

Legislating bullying prevention programs makes intuitive sense because teachers have ample access to large populations of children and youth. However, in the face of fiscal pressure, increasing curriculum demands, and vague community-school jurisdiction issues, this has resulted in the form and level of bullying prevention programs having much variance throughout Ontario (Mitchell, 2012). Very little money has been invested in measuring how the policies have been implemented in practice, and what the challenges are for students, staff and parents to whom they apply (Mitchell, 2012).

The Ontario Ombudsman is now accepting complaints on school boards (effective as of September, 2015). This change is partly due to increasing numbers of school board complaints being made to the Ombudsman over the past few years. In 2013-2014 there were 147 school board complaints and inquiries which were declined for jurisdictional reasons. Contacting the Ombudsman is a last resort measure, after parents have sought out assistance from teachers and school principles.

School & community programs
Accordingly, bullying prevention programs in schools were recently assessed by the Ontario Institute for Education Leadership (2014) by inviting the leads of 72 district schools to ask their Safe and Accepting Schools team to complete a qualitative and quantitative survey. The survey was complimented by focus groups composed of diverse stakeholders. Factors which came to the forefront in this study as key themes to implementing sustainable school programming were (1) strong communication, (2) partnerships, (3) strategic alignment, (4) whole school approaches, (5) cohesive teams, (6) evidence
based research, (7) vision, and (8) systemic approaches. Reported barriers were (1) resources and time, (2) strategic alignment across all schools, (3) data collection and analysis limitations due to lack of specified training and tools.

Ansary et al. (2015) provides a context to understanding the stronger elements of bullying prevention initiatives by identifying the common tenets across the most successful programs. Their analysis supports the use of holistic school approaches that build positive school climates and address socio-ecological risk factors through applying developmentally appropriate interventions. They also find support for creating avenues of peer and staff leadership, staff training on how to respond to bullying that addresses the needs of both the perpetrator and victim, program structure of social emotional competency development, promotion of upstander behaviours, and systematic evaluations within coordinated and sustainable initiatives.

Similarly, a recent meta-analysis by Lee, Kim and Kim (2015) focuses on 13 high caliber studies which contain data on Q quotient and effect sizes. Schools that established clear policies on bullying were found to be significantly more effective than programs with a curriculum focus (written hand-outs, definitions, explicit directions etc...) and social skill training (negotiation skills, cooperation etc...). Training in emotional control and peer counselling were also effective across studies.

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) performed a rigid systematic review of 44 published and unpublished reports of evaluations of anti-bullying programs from 1983 to 2009, measuring the effect sizes for programming interventions in controlled studies. They conclude that bullying prevention programs were modestly effective, and more effective for older youths. No significant effects were found for peer engagement and support programs, but they did find support for programs with 20 hours or more of program delivery, staff-parent meetings, parent training and information, teacher training, clear and consistent disciplinary practices, and improved playground supervision.

Yeager et al. (2015) conducted a more recent meta-analysis by applying a similar criterion to Ttofi and Farrington (2011), but they excluded research that lacked quantification of effect size by age, and they included more recent studies up until the year 2013. Within their final sample of 19 studies, 70% of the programs researched contained explicit program rules and directions for social behaviours. When isolating age as a variable, a low level of efficacy of anti-bullying programs was evident in lower grades (until grade 7), and from grades 8-12 bullying prevention programming had no significant effect. This suggests that developmentally older youths have distinct motivations for bullying which are not being...
addressed. Sexual competition peaks in adolescence, and there is often a desire to assert independence through challenging authority. Yeager et al. (2015) concludes that anti-bullying programs for youths still hold potential, but they need to be carried out in a way which is developmentally appropriate and take into account the adolescent need for autonomy and independence.

A study by Paton et al. (2015) sheds some light on this issue by identifying 24 empirically based qualitative studies on student perceptions of bulling. The following is a summary of some of the finding which relate to developmental differences. Primary school children were found to bully others for pro-active and instrumental reasons, as well as having reactive and emotional aggression. It is also often associated with boredom, inactivity, fantasy, and a passive attitude towards school. Scripts and story lines were often used by children to anticipate and recreate real life experience, and when comparing grades 5-8, older students were more reluctant to tell either an adult or peers. Older youths (ages 13 and up) reported frequent verbal and indirect bullying, which was sexual in nature. Gender was found to influences violent and aggressive behaviour, peer relationships, popularity and emotions. Unsupportive class environments were reported as a causal factor of bullying victimization by shy youths, and issue was brought up regarding inappropriate adult actions and the difference between how adults and youth define bullying.

Non-recommended practice in programming
The following are the non-recommended practices in bullying prevention programming.

- Zero tolerance policies are overly punitive and do not work with children from a rehabilitative framework. They can sometimes make the behaviour worse (APA zero tolerance task force, 2008). Research supports the use of hierarchical levels of consequences, and restorative justice models where appropriate (Molnar-Maine, 2014).
- Disciplinary measures which are solely punitive have been shown to have limited benefits, if any, in terms of curbing inappropriate behaviours (Pepler & Craig, 2014, Cohen, 2002).
- Conflict resolution and peer mediation in an incident of bullying could be harmful for the person with less power in the relationship- it suggests that the person with less power has some control in determining the situation when they have very little (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d).
- Messages that bullying causes others to have acts of violence or to commit suicide should be avoided. Extreme acts of violence and/or self-harm are not caused by bullying alone, but a
multiple of factors. Focusing on these aspects normalizes them as appropriate responses for victims, perpetuating the likelihood that they will occur (CDC, n.d.).

- “Piece meal approaches” or “one-off” initiatives, such as a one-time assembly addressing bullying (Pepler & Craig, 2014). The extent of the plan, and the way it is implemented influences how effective initiatives will be (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011) and without a comprehensive on-going strategy in place, one time projects run the risk of increasing bullying through the power of suggestion. Using celebrity status to reduce bullying is also ineffective (Pepler & Craig, 2014) as it does not change the structures which are supporting the behaviour.

- Group treatment for children who bully can lead to an increase in bullying and is not recommended (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.).

- Don’t immediately try to sort out the facts (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.). Questioning children/youth right after an incident when they are all together can lead to children/youth feeling pressured to lie for the purpose of protection or bravado, and victimized children being blamed for being bullied.

- Advising children to avoiding social media as a way of avoiding electronic bullying (Pepler & Craig, 2014). Ignoring adults’ bullying and relationships—these are models for children (Pepler & Craig, 2014).

- Youth engagement programs which provide token positions to a few privileged youths who speak for all youth. Instead have a participatory approach where leaders are responsible for gathering information from peers and reporting opinions from their group after consultation. (Pan Canadian Consortium for School Health + The Center for Excellence in Youth Engagement, n.d.).

Parents

Recently, a mega analysis (Lereya, Samara & Wolke, 2013) was conducted to determine the influence of parenting behaviours on the risk of becoming a bully or victim between 1970 and 2012. Their final sample was composed of 70 research projects, with a child age range of 4 to 25 years. They found a small to moderate effect of children who were bullied being exposed to negative parenting- which included abuse, neglect, and/or maladaptive parenting. This effect was larger in bully/victim groups.
Following this, positive parenting, as defined by good communication, warm, and affectionate relationships, parental involvement, support and monitoring was found to produce small to medium protective effects (Lereya, Samara & Wolke, 2013). This type of parenting can be taught successfully through "facilitative parenting" programs that coach parents to teach children social skills and open up friendship opportunities for them in a warm manner. In clinical testing, the combination of child social emotional training with facilitative parenting training was found to be highly effective (Healy & Sanders, 2013).

Craig & Pepler (2014) found similar results in their analysis of HSBC results. Good quality parental relationships are consistently related to lower levels (around 15%) of bullying and being bullied. To this affect, children and youth who are victimized are more likely than other youth to experience high levels of parental intrusiveness (e.g., controlling the child’s play, interrupting the child’s activities, interfering with the child’s goals). Curiously, females were found to be more strongly influence by the quality of parental relationships than males.

Research has also indicated that parental monitoring of children who are bullying others can make a significant short and long term impact in reducing harm. Vassallo et al. (2014) identified children who reported bullying others at the age of 13-14 on a three point scale, and re-tested them at the age of 19-20 for depression and anti-social behaviours, while also surveying parenting methods. At the age of 13 and 14, children who bullied others tended to have far more accompanied anti-social behaviors when their parents were monitoring them at low levels, while children who bullied others had fairly low anti-social behaviours when they were being monitored at a moderate or high level. Parental monitoring was also the only factor which reduced later in life anti-social behavior, even after controlling for demographic characteristics of gender, parent age and educational levels.

Notably, the level of communication between parent and child does not necessarily equate to a "high quality relationship". Children and youth are not less likely to bully others when they have a lot of communication with their parents. Stavrinides, Nikiforou & Georgiou (2015) tested bullying from the perspective of the parent and the child across two time points in a 6 month intervals. In the second time period, children who bullied others continued this action when they had on-going and broad communication with their parents, and were less likely to continue if their parents sought out information from their children’s peers, and the parents of peers (in a discreet manner), and asked their
child factual information. This may be explained due to parental over-reliance on the validity of their child’s input leading to a maladaptive sense of security.

According to a partial review of literature on bullying and family therapy, Narrative Family Therapy and Strategic/Structural Family Therapy serve as complimentary approaches to define the problem of bullying within the unique and subjective context of the family, and to assist with communication and negotiation strategies to redistribute unequal divisions of power (Powell & Ladd, 2010). In a randomized design with an assessment control, and based on observation as well as multiple informants, evidence was found to indicate that parent training in these techniques lead to lower child distress (Healy & Sanders, 2014).

**Peers**

A meta-analysis of 153 studies identifies the capacity of certain characteristics of youths ‘contexts (e.g., their schools, communities, etc.) to accurately predict involvement in bullying. The two strongest “contextual predictors” were peer influence (i.e. the positive or negative influence of peers, including having negative behavior reinforced or engaging in prosocial group activities) and community factors (i.e., socioeconomic levels and rates of violence and crime) (Cook et al., 2010). In Ontario, student led activities and organizations that support safe and inclusive learning are mandated by the Ministry of Education through Program Policy Memorandum 145.

In a meta-analysis of 12 school-based programs, Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott (2012) researched what made bystanders more likely to intervene. After being exposed to school based bullying prevention programs, bystanders tended to intervene more often in situations of bullying. Interestingly, when isolating the level of empathy reported for victims, there was no significant difference between children/youth who had participated in programs and their control groups, so empathy is generally not a tool to transition students from bystanders to upstanders.

In a recent study of 2,589 students across five Canadian middle schools, students believed bullying perpetration, victimization, and pro-bullying attitudes were far more frequent than what was reported from adult population (Perkins, Craig, & Perkins, 2011). This difference in perspectives could be due to a number of factors such as more or less personal vulnerability, how different populations define bullying, or bullying occurring in unsupervised areas. Why this is important is because it highlights the need for
youth peer input and involvement, as there are unique situational factors which are not perceived outside of the youth context.

Rivers et al. (2009) conducted a study on 2002 students in the United Kingdom, observing the effect of witnessing violence versus being actively involved. Most students had witnessed violence in the school (63%). In this sample, girls reported observing violence slightly more than boys. Bystanders reported more negative effects in mental health from witnessing violence than either perpetrators or victims, and this was not dependent on whether the bystander had been targeted in the past. Higher levels of substance use were also found in both students who reported bullying others, and in bystanders.

**Individual Factors**

**DisAbilities/ Psychological Functioning.** Generally, higher prevalence rates of bullying due to demographic characteristics of gender, race and ethnicity vary somewhat with the composition and context of societies. However, disabilities and psychological functioning have higher rates of victimization across contexts (Cook et al., 2010).

Chronological factors further contribute to the on-going and cyclical nature of bullying re-victimization and perpetration (Swearer & Hymel, 2015). Stress responses which are elicited through incidents of bullying has been shown to result in a physical and genetic disruptions to healthy child development (Vaillancourt, April 21st, 2015), which increases the risk of future bullying. Particularly for disabled or mentally ill children, the stress of being bullied can heighten pre-existing conditions.

Through analyzing the results of the HSBC (2010) study, Craig & McCuaig Edge (2012) found an association between children who are bullied having a lower sense of wellbeing, and children who bully others having related behavioral problems. Children who acted to both bully and were bullied had the lowest ratings for emotional wellbeing, suggesting a cumulative effect.

Children who exclusively bully others and are not victimized tend to be aggressive or easily frustrated, think badly of others, and have difficulty following rules (Cook et al., 2010). Long term outcomes for children who bully are further anti-social and criminal behaviours and sexual harassment (Ttofi et al., 2011). In this case, mental illness such as ADHD, conduct disorder and addictions have a high degree of overlap with children who bully others (Copeland et al., 2013).

Still some researchers have found evidence that there is a sub section of “bullying” children/youth (particularly in later adolescence) that have high self-esteem, strive for power within groups, and have
strong social skills (Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003, Faris & Ennett, 2012). Children and youth who bully others are more likely to perceive the environment as being supportive of bullying behaviours, and of having pro-bullying attitudes themselves (Williams & Guerra, 2007).

**Cognitive, Social and Academic Skills.** Victims, bullies, and bully-victims possess similar deficits in social problem solving skills which are often applied in everyday negotiation and confrontations (Cook et al. 2010). They also have higher frequencies of negative attributions for behaviours (Espelage, 2014). Children who are bullied also often experience problems in temporal sequencing which could be related to trauma imposed upon them (Vaillancourt et al., 2013). The opposite is also true, high academic marks and social skills have protective factors for reducing depression in victims of bullying later in life (Vasallo et al., 2014).

**Empathy.** The role of cognitive and affective empathy has is central to bullying; victimization, bystanding, and defending. In a recent literature review (van Noorden et al., 2015) encompassing 24 studies on cognitive empathy and 38 studies on affective empathy, defending was found to be consistently positively correlated with cognitive and affective empathy, bullying was negatively associated with cognitive and affective empathy, and victimization was negatively correlated with cognitive but not with affective empathy This suggests that a critical element of bullying prevention programs for children and youth is the development of cognitive empathy in victims of bullying, and both cognitive and affective empathy training in children. This presents challenges in the field of bullying prevention programming, as after program completion there is normally a rise in children and youth willing to intervene, but the reason they cite is not an increase in empathy (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012). It may be that empathy is a deep rooted characteristic which is not easily fostered within individuals.

**Weight.** Puhl, Peterson and Lueficke (2013) ran a quantitative and qualitative study at two national weight reduction camps in the U.S, asking youths between the ages of 14-18 years of age about their experiences with weight based victimization, and who was targeting them. Of 550 participants, 94% experienced weight based bullying, mostly from peers (92%), and friends (70%), but parents (37%) and teachers (27%) were also perpetrators of weight based bullying behaviors. Further studies have corroborated that particularly for overweight children and youth, health status and psychological functioning is related to bullying (Espelage, 2014).
LGBTQ. The first national climate survey on homophobia, biphobia, and transphobia in Canadian schools was published in 2011 (Taylor & Peter) with a sample of 3607 participants from 149 districts across Canada. Three quarters of the participants identified as straight/heterosexual. Schools with established anti-bullying policies had higher rates of LGBTQ students not being physically (80%) or verbally (46%) harassed compared to those without (67% and 40% respectively). Unsafe areas were reported as being in the physical education change rooms, washrooms, and hallways for all Canadian Students, but this was particularly high for LGBTQ students. Homophobic and transphobic comments were heard by almost the entire sample of LGBTQ students from peers, and in some situations from teachers as well.

Mishna, Newman, Daley & Solomon (2007) interviewed nine key Canadian informants from education and social services to develop qualitative data. Respondents reported concerns that homophobic bullying was inadequately addressed, and that sexual minority youth were exposed to pervasive, and on-going bullying from multiple contexts.

Suicidal Ideation. Involvement in bullying, either as an aggressor or as a victim may lead to feelings of helplessness and hopelessness that raises the risk of suicide. Bullying and suicide are closely related so this is an additional reason bullying prevention and intervention is critical to protecting children and youth from harm (Kim & Leventhal, 2008).

In a meta-analysis looking at 34 studies linking peer victimization, cyberbullying and suicidal ideation, consistent effect sizes were found across both gender and ages of children (van Geel, Vedder, & Tanilon, 2014). Their research confirmed that peer victimization by cyberbullying is a significant risk factor for youth suicide, even more so than traditional forms of bullying.

That being said, bullying is one risk factor among many which contributes to suicidal ideation and thoughts, and a causal relationship has never been established. In fact, most youth who are involved in bullying do NOT engage in suicide related behaviours. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control from the U.S. summarize the following key points regarding suicide ideation, bullying, and youths (n.d., p. 6 & 7).

- Youth who are able to cope with problems in healthy ways and solve problems peacefully are less likely to engage in both suicide and bullying related behaviours
Youth with disabilities, learning differences, sexual/gender identity differences are more vulnerable to being bullied

Youths who report frequently bullying others are at high long-term risk of suicide related behaviours.

Youth who report being frequently bullied by others are at increased risk of suicide and negative physical and mental health outcomes.

GAPS IN RESEARCH

Research is currently largely invested in longitudinal studies which document the negative outcomes for children who have been involved with various types of bullying, biological studies indicating genetic manipulations which are produced by the stress of bullying, and studies which document the amount and depth of bullying directed towards subsections of society (Zych, Ortego-Ruiz & Del Rey, 2015). While these studies help us to understand some of the complexities of bullying, they may lead the reader to presume that it is somehow unavoidable, and therefore investment in prevention and intervention would not be advisable.

To this effect, although there are numerous recommendations for communities to form coalitions designed to address systemic changes to reduce bullying behaviours, there is a gap particularly in Canadian research on what standards to put into place at a community level, and how to best build capacity and engagement across the community.
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## Appendix A: Youth Focus Group Results

**Bullying at a Rural Ottawa High School – Focus Group Summary (2014)**

**All Identifying information has been removed prior to publication**

### Where does bullying happen in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school bus</td>
<td>Math hall</td>
<td>parking lot</td>
<td>physical fights don’t usually happen on school grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Hall</td>
<td>all girls’ bathroom</td>
<td>cell phones (inside and outside school)</td>
<td>-don’t want cameras to see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Hall</td>
<td>suggested taking out big mirrors</td>
<td>under the stairs</td>
<td>-outside weight room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all gyms</td>
<td>science hall</td>
<td>people throw food down</td>
<td>-under the stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area to left of gym</td>
<td>tech hall</td>
<td>-not supposed to be there but some teachers enforce and some don’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>tech hall (during class)</td>
<td>-conservation area</td>
<td>-cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science hall</td>
<td>end of English hall by exit to smoking section</td>
<td>-over pass</td>
<td>-splitting tables up didn’t help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business hall</td>
<td>smoking section</td>
<td>-tech hall –busiest hall</td>
<td>-mostly grade 12s in preferred spots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tech hall</td>
<td>-caf–divided into big groups</td>
<td>-history hall</td>
<td>“No one tells us no.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geography hall</td>
<td>-Preferred spots taken by Gr 12s, territorial</td>
<td>-cafeteria</td>
<td>-main entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history hall</td>
<td>-bleachers</td>
<td>-there’s an obvious division</td>
<td>-alcove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English hall</td>
<td>-parties-wheeling - people take pics and post on social media</td>
<td>down the centre of where</td>
<td>-tech hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grad hall</td>
<td>-McBean during lunch – boys honk at girls who are walking and will yell at them</td>
<td>people and grades sit</td>
<td>-back entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*.all halls</td>
<td>-bussing from far distances because there are more people on them and the people don’t know each other as well- back of the bus is for the</td>
<td>-recent moving around of tables has been helpful</td>
<td>-just outside the drama room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside front of school</td>
<td>-end of hall by doors to smoking section</td>
<td>-alcove</td>
<td>-smoking section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoking section</td>
<td>-having the principal here in the morning</td>
<td>-end of hall by doors to smoking section</td>
<td>-doors to smoking section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gr. 12s helps

*Safe Spaces:*
- all gyms – because the classes aren’t coed
- science hall
- music room
- alcove
- library
- any area with less lockers
- “teachers don’t like to be in this hall”
- smoking section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When does bullying happen?</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- between periods</td>
<td>-not morning, people are so tired</td>
<td>-lunch</td>
<td>-between classes</td>
<td>-lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- breaks</td>
<td>-lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lunch</td>
<td>-after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Classes reported that student bullying does not happen during class time.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does bullying look like at your school?</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- groups ganging up on others</td>
<td>-happens in large groups with audience</td>
<td>-physical:</td>
<td>-rumors about sexual experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- high school is more about being friends with who is popular and who will invite you to parties vs. who you just want to be friends with</td>
<td>-mob of grade 12s and some 11s</td>
<td>-pushing/shoving</td>
<td>-grades discrimination (depends on the person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fights</td>
<td>-“popular” ones and smokers</td>
<td>-beat up (gay)</td>
<td>-twitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- exclusion – in the caf in terms of where people sit</td>
<td>-music kids don’t get targeted as much, they are safe</td>
<td>-intimidation between grades</td>
<td>-whispering in halls (mostly girls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- people sit alone at lunch outside the caf because they don’t want</td>
<td>-lots of verbal -name calling -“slut” (girls)</td>
<td>-pushing in halls</td>
<td>-in class - making fun of others’ answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-there are “more names for girls”</td>
<td>-shoving to get to lockers</td>
<td>-people crying in the halls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-overcrowding</td>
<td>-verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-picking students up to move them out of the way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to go inside
-peer pressure
-people change what they wear and say to feel more confident and fit in
-drugs and alcohol
-older students will pressure or students feel the pressure (real vs. perceived; explicit vs. implicit)
-in high school now and people feel they can do whatever they want now
-take more risks
-feel and act older than they are and try to be more mature
-name calling
-less physical – sometimes with guys pushing each other around
-social-emotional:
-talking about people
-gossip
-one person isolated/groups
-cyber: -pictures with negative comments
-creating facebook accounts
-most common is texting
-academic bullying
-bumping into people on purpose
-fights happen off school property
-sexual –guys trying to touch girls’ chests “by accident”
-anonymous harassment
-parties, wheeling pictures, social media, rumors, cyberbullying
-Social-emotional:
-dirty looks
-isolation
-ignoring
-discrimination because of sexual orientation
-racism, when in contact with other schools that are more culturally diverse
-discrimination about clothing
-Verbal:-name calling
-Cyber:-texting (name calling)
-more happening over cyber so it isn’t face to face
-school isn’t doing enough to deal with this ambiguity on how to deal with it
-twitter is a big tool for cyber bullying
-Social/ emotional bullying lots among grade 12 girls- dance conflict all over school, lots of drama
-social
-judgments (comments/ looks/ actions)
-twitter (lots of bullying) indirect tweets teaming up against others e.g. dance
-Facebook groups created to bash another person posting pictures and making negative comments
-boys more ace to face change their routine- avoid the cafeteria
-depressing tweets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>feel less important</td>
<td>switching schools</td>
<td>for younger grades – intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not confident</td>
<td>don’t have status</td>
<td>people taking more risks</td>
<td>-weak, fear, sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerless</td>
<td>not valued</td>
<td>substance abuse</td>
<td>-separating social groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>don’t want to be with others</td>
<td>self-harm, cutting</td>
<td>-isolation, alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwanted</td>
<td>isolated</td>
<td>Alone/isolated</td>
<td>-increase or decrease of social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like there’s something wrong with them</td>
<td>lack of trust in friends and people in general</td>
<td>Scared to show emotion-will never cry at school</td>
<td>-physical/emotional issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-begin to believe the rumors about them are true</td>
<td>-don’t want to come to school</td>
<td>-People think because it is (name removed) it is okay to be racist/prejudice in general</td>
<td>-increase in conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-people try not to let it show that it bothers them</td>
<td>-give up hope</td>
<td>-more negativity at school in general these days</td>
<td>-suicide attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-girls take sides</td>
<td>-don’t want to be around others</td>
<td>-bullies gain a reputation</td>
<td>-depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-more popularity = more support</td>
<td>-more negativity at school in general these days</td>
<td>-chain of bullying and being victimized, roles are fluid and switch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-it’s nice to be able to change classes and be with different people</td>
<td></td>
<td>-if there’s a close friend group and someone starts bullying, that person will get left out, but then are we bullying this person by leaving them out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What does bullying sound like at School? What are people saying? |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | Grade 12 |
| -students think bullying is bad -but still hear about it, physical fights | -same people always harassing others verbally | -talking about the issues | |
| -debates over who should like (student | -“that’s so gay” | | |
| | -“retarded” –need | | |
council)
-being called “gay” just to be hurtful (“That’s so gay.”)
-calling girls “bitch”

more discussion around this to help understand the impact

-on average school is okay

-self-harm
-more girls – insecurities about: voice, weight (too thin/fat), height (too short/tall), grades

Do you feel like you can talk to school staff about bullying?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-not as much anymore since being in new school</td>
<td>-not reporting because it doesn’t change anything</td>
<td>-certain teachers, yes</td>
<td>-teachers avoid it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-prefer to talk to friend or parent</td>
<td>-teacher intervene and nothing changes</td>
<td>-don’t want them to know too much (they might know other members of your family, etc)</td>
<td>-staff don’t know or don’t get full story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-don’t know the teachers personally</td>
<td>-hearing it from a teammate more effective than a teacher</td>
<td>-Gr. 9s don’t know staff well enough to be comfortable</td>
<td>-not able to open up to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-students see that this isn’t teachers’ role or skill set</td>
<td>-depends on the comfort level of teacher</td>
<td>-students don’t want to be put into a situation where they have to face the person bullying them</td>
<td>-gr. 9s might not feel comfortable because they have a lot on their plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-BUT there’s a false sense of security in telling new friends</td>
<td>-if teachers haven’t built trust, won’t talk to them</td>
<td>-they think this will make it worse</td>
<td>-a lot of new experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-friends might break trust and tell others</td>
<td>-they don’t do anything</td>
<td>-reasons students don’t want to report:</td>
<td>-feel like outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-grade 9s are new and don’t know teachers</td>
<td>-students don’t believe they’ll help</td>
<td>-afraid it will get worse</td>
<td>-haven’t had the chance to build the relationships with each other and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-elementary school is less serious</td>
<td>-consistent rule and behaviours aren’t enforced in class</td>
<td>-follow through by teachers with consequences not effective enough</td>
<td>-will report to younger teachers or teachers who make an effort to get to know them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teachers have to manage more than one class so why would they care/how could they care?</td>
<td>-not dealing with bad behaviour in effective way</td>
<td>-no consequences</td>
<td>-comfortable with teachers of sports team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-student might not want to tell because they don’t want person who</td>
<td>-need more consequences, more detentions</td>
<td>-perception is that staff don’t want to deal with it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-group work -almost always someone gets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is bullying to know that you told on them. Only 1 of many
-don’t want to confront, just confide in adult
-afraid it will get worse if tell
-feel more comfortable with guidance than with teachers
-teachers just focus on teaching
-feel awkward talking to teachers
-don’t feel like they’ll believe you

left out
-suggestion: should always number students, don’t let students pick groups
-new students don’t have a favourite teacher to talk to
-new students don’t have supports or feel comfortable at first
-teachers are grumpy and aren’t open to talking
-they say no because it’s not class time
-but students don’t want to talk during class because they don’t want others hearing or knowing and might get picked on for being teacher’s pet
-between classes and lunch is better to talk
-not all teachers, favourite teachers are good
-some teachers will pay more attention to their “favourites”
-some teachers have students who they pick on more

-Not comfortable, no time, don’t want to be seen telling a teacher, teachers don’t want to get involved
-Don’t really care, only a few teachers we can approach
-depends on the teacher and how much rapport you have with them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can staff do differently to help students more?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-don’t think they could, might make it worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teachers need to show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rapport is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-show an interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-effort to build relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-respect it when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-don’t yell at students because this intimidates them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that they are on the side of the student reporting
- teachers play favourites
  - boy who cried wolf, favours girls
- if they are too strict students won’t trust them
- be more like a fiend, but not too close, like an aunt or uncle
- have a teacher who is “Head of Year” for each grade – this is the teacher who everyone from that grade could go to if they have a problem (England)
- show they care
- share experiences
- try to connect with students
- give trust/get trust
- be available to talk between classes and during lunch
- don’t lock door and keep it open between classes
- keep in sight line of door during lunch
- like when teachers joke and are sarcastic
- feels more like friends and can talk
- be more open, become people, more personable
- show interest
- share personal stories
- calm environment
- makes you feel more open
- not wailing on for answers all the time
- not everyone will excel in every subject, teachers need to understand this
- be considerate to other people’s abilities
- more available for kids who need extra help academically

- teachers draw a boundary, ex when overhear something and say it’s wrong.
- Need consistency with rules- rule enforcement depends on teacher
- develop a relationship
- share personal stories, but not too much or too soon
- don’t be overly friendly/try too hard
- ask students if they are ok when they are looking down
- state that you’re open to communicating, that you’re here to help
- share personal stories that students can relate to
- would feel more comfortable if they opened up to us first
- talk on a more personal level
- share their own experience on the topic
- teachers can open up right away (to gr. 9s especially)
- be available at times you need them, not just during class
- lunches, break
- build relationships
- showing an interest in students
- more effort to connect with students
- would go to a past teacher
- online tool would be effective more for
- be more adaptive to how people learn (different learning styles)

- witness

- address the problem when it comes up

---

### What are the current rules, policies, procedures, etc. at school for dealing with bullying? Is it working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - don’t know
- haven’t talked about it
- know about bullying from elementary school but don’t know consequences here
- people know that they can report but no one does
- consequences depend on the case – suspension
- no idea what the consequences are
- physical fight = suspension
- social-emotional very difficult, no consequences for this. Usually continues | - suspension or expulsion – physical acts but they come back and it doesn’t really work
- need more parent involvement
- would be helpful to have clear consequences about bullying and cyberbullying
- a talking to
- if it happens a lot or if it’s very serious will be a suspension
- no clear or written rules
- only if serious
- certain teachers enforce rules others don’t.
- teachers say they’ll deal with it but it doesn’t change
- they say it’s the worst thing but it isn’t dealt with
- “Posters advertising bullying” – useless because it’s not enforced | - don’t know of the policies/procedures
- don’t hear about it
- guidance will work with teachers
- inconsistency with teachers
- no rules about bullying - just about respect
- verbal intervention to stop it immediately but if it happens again nothing happens
- things that happen outside of school come back to school
- we have cameras somewhat helpful not a solution people know where the cameras are and avoid | - Clear reporting system
- cameras
- when students report anything, take it seriously, don’t say we’ll “deal with it later” |

---

### What could be changed at school to make it a better and safer place to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - have an online reporting system that’s anonymous
- need to encourage people to tell, make it more normal | - would be helpful to know how to best support our friends
- not enough detention – after school so parents are involved because | - would be helpful to have defined consequences - level 1 - level 3.
- more education around social/emotion | - Clear reporting system
- cameras
- when students report anything, take it seriously, don’t say we’ll “deal with it later” |
-education is already done, we need more than just awareness
-focus on what you can actually do
-more meetings with guidance, mandatory drop-ins to get to know them and build a relationship instead of just going when you have a problem
-fun presentations, not too long
-hear from people with lived experiences in small groups/classes
-relaxed conversations, not trying too hard. Like this!
-trainings – have guidance deliver or other students (students from every grade)
-don’t like bare walls
-like the new music, want more music
-new art in school/repaint
-want more art to participate in
-anonymous notes to report
-online reporting
-have one way to report
-report to guidance
-Ambassador/Linking Program Crew more ongoing
-they have to come pick them up?
-V.P. usually gives consequences but peer group has more influence
-online reporting would work
-leadership camp – more of this
-use leadership model to pick something they’d like to do
-activities like leadership camp
-small groups to connect with others, more interactive
-Ambassador/Linking Program Crew not helpful
-needs to be more
-4 grades
-activities that include everyone
-something during the week, something together
-make interest groups
-self-reflection –to care
-spirit week – get kids out of the classroom for activity/session
-more than getting dressed-up
-get feedback, our ideas are important
-bullying
-better supervision in halls
-more severe consequences for intimidation
-security cameras aren’t working
-assemblies not effective
-need smaller groups, without friends
-different grades coming together
-have a support group for those who bully
-clear rules
-more follow through
-peer helpers
-act like the Ambassador/Linking Program crew but for the whole year
-students are more comfortable talking to peers
-need to pick the right students for this job and monitor them
-we have girls’ groups but need guys’ group too
-guys feel like they can’t talk
-about these issues
-should be small group
(more office)
-new admin is better
-get parents involved
-parents can talk on your behalf
-spirit day
-like painting the halls, friendly and clam colours
-8am start is too early. Would rather finish later
-Ambassador/Linking Program Crew
-intermingles grades
-big games (like Olympics) don’t create time to talk and really connect
-feels like forced team building
-more sharing of experiences and getting to know each other (leadership camp)
-“School does a pretty good job.”
-assemblies don not work unless there is class opportunity to discuss small groups work better
-teachers need to be approachable
-not a lot of prevention just more reactionary support
- Ambassador/Linking Program Crew is good
- connect with friends
- get out of class
- feel more comfortable at school
- gets rid of stereotypes
- Ambassador/Linking Program Crew is helpful
- take you around school
- big brother/sister
- should be more ongoing
- Leadership camp (very successful)
- big brother/sister (gives you someone to talk to)
- having guidance counsellors is very helpful
- have check-ins
- go above and beyond to see how they are doing
- ask parents
- assemblies don't work
- easily distracted
- people go on Twitter
- more class activities and opportunities to interact
- more opportunities, have their own account
- afraid to attend focus groups, afraid of being

- need to feel valued!!
- would be helpful to be able to hear announcements
- lots of clubs and more variety
- art club, lunch club, some clubs are too structured
- more just for fun and not a big commitment
- open gym more often and make it known
- no judging/no rank
- people by comfortable to be who they are
- motivational speakers (about how they made it through struggles)
- young people and older people who share their stories
- more education
- “how to stand up” / “the skills to stand up”
- VP and Principal be more visible. When they are visible and show that they are excited and show enthusiasm, their leadership makes a huge difference
- make people more intolerant to bullying – students AND teachers
- warning signs of bullying
- “knowledge is power” with friends/peers
- no initiation
- address sexism and stereotypes
- more guy involvement
- sexism gets reinforced by staff (ex. guys vs. girls wearing tank tops)
- sex ed. –guys aren’t as educated as girls. In guys’ class teachers just crack jokes
- instead of assemblies, older students talking to younger students more effective but need training needs to be ongoing not just one time...
- if teachers told students they are free to talk or tell them they can leave a note to talk
- should have an online reporting tool
- support groups like Girls talk work really well
- groups that could engage larger groups targeting grades 9 and 10.
- peer helper, peer ambassadors - pairing older kids with younger kids
- student orientation - new student - use Ambassador/Linking

-Ambassador/Linking Program crew great for younger grades not with older grades
- sports/clubs really important being part of a team or club makes a difference
- leadership camp an amazing opportunity continue the groups after school and at school like once a week.
- more opportunities for different grades to interact - divide into teams
- girls talk - support groups
- being in grade 12 makes a difference have had the opportunity to interact with own grade a lot as well as other grades especially he grade above and below
- come out of your shell in grade 12
judged
- spirit days – more free food
- breakfast club
- need more clubs for grade 9s
- announcements – can’t hear, too fast, right after bell so students are changing classes and not listening

- more positivity
- peer leaders – could work within peer groups to promote inclusivity
- know what’s going on
- NOT cameras
- makes school feel like a prison
- invading privacy
- too much secrecy

Program Crew – add bullying information and resource
- build on Ambassador / Linking Program Crew concept
- need leaders to support school community- focus on bullying
## Appendix B: Online Tool Box (in progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE SECTOR TOOLKITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Toolkit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ophelia Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PACER’s National Bullying Prevention Center | Focus is on protecting children and youth with disabilities, also provides stakeholder engagement and civic action toolkits (educators, parents, community coalition + youths). Activities for Youth Classroom toolkits Community toolkits Student Created Toolkits | [http://www.pacer.org/bullying/resources/toolkits/](http://www.pacer.org/bullying/resources/toolkits/)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIALIZED SECTORS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Parent Lifelines of Eastern Ontario- **</td>
<td><strong>Guide for parents with ideas &amp; explanations for how to help children develop resiliency:</strong></td>
<td>**Parent Lifelines of Eastern Ontario- **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kids Can Cope- Parenting Resilient Children at Home and at School</em></td>
<td>Understanding resiliency</td>
<td><em>Kids Can Cope- Parenting Resilient Children at Home and at School</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How resiliency develops in children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How parents build resiliency in children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resiliency in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resiliency for parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Anti-Bullying Coalition Parent Advocacy Guide for Children in the Public Education System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Basic information on what is bullying, and what steps parents can take to advocate for their child with schools.</strong></td>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.londonabc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/LABCTOOLKIT2013f.pdf">http://www.londonabc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/LABCTOOLKIT2013f.pdf</a></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Supportive Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Training modules for classroom teachers, bus drivers.</strong></td>
<td><strong><a href="http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/training-technical-assistance/training-products-tools/training-toolkits">http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/training-technical-assistance/training-products-tools/training-toolkits</a></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by the American Institutes for Research</td>
<td>Ways to address topic of dating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Student Engagement Toolkit:** PanCanadian Consortium for School Health and the Center for Excellence in Youth Engagement | a) How to initiate youth engagement  
b) 8 Qualities of Positive Youth Engagement Setting:  
1. Physical and psychological Safety  
2. Appropriate structure  
3. Supportive relationships  
4. Opportunities for belonging and meaningful inclusion  
5. Positive social norms  
6. Support for efficacy and mattering  
7. Provide opportunities for skill building and learning  
8. Integration of family, school and community efforts  
c) Sustaining Youth Engagement  
| **Bullying Prevention and Intervention in the school environment- factsheets and tools** | Table of Contents:  
1) Timeline for Bullying Prevention Activities | http://www.prevnet.ca/sites/prevnet.ca/files/prevnet_facts_and_tools_for_schools.pdf#page=1 |
2) Critical questions in determining bullying, aggression or teaching

3) How to create a supportive framework for whole school approaches
   a. Creating Community Partnerships (Tool)
   b. Roles and Responsibilities of Champions (Tool)
   c. Integrating Bullying Prevention into Classroom Learning Curriculum (Tool)
   d. Sample Strategies and Activities for a Whole School Approach to Bullying Prevention

4) Mapping tool for finding where bullying exists in your school/environmental scan

5) Bullying prevention needs assessment tool

6) What to do with a child or youth who engages in bullying (Tool)

7) Classroom techniques: Scaffolding, Coaching, Social Architecture

8) How to choose an appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Based Bullying Prevention Program</th>
<th>Youth Engagement - STRYVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on prevention of bullying. Detailed resources for prevention, planning, acquiring relevant data, evaluation, and building strategies.</td>
<td>Striving to Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere - Led by the U.S. Center for Disease Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Based Bullying Intervention and Prevention Support

Website launched by the Teacher's Federation of Ontario and the Centre Ontarian de prevention des agressions (COPA). Project funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education.

Training modules with dialogue, sound bites to hear how direction can be applied with students, information on equity and inclusive education practice.

http://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/stryve/home.html

http://www.safeatschool.ca/about-safeschool
### Integrating Bullying Prevention and Restorative Practices in Schools: Considerations for practitioners and policy makers.

Center for Safe Schools, Clemson Institute on Family and Neighborhood Life, Highmark Foundation. Molnar-Maine, S. (014)

Guidance on how to effectively integrate bullying prevention programs with restorative justice approaches


### Summer camp bullying prevention and intervention toolkit

Bullying prevention programs geared towards summer camps- policy, staff training, Example letters to parents re: bullying policies

[http://www.acacamps.org/bullying](http://www.acacamps.org/bullying)

### Ottawa French School Board Resources


Information for parents of children who are “Victims” of bullying from the Catholic French board [http://www.ecolecatholique.ca/user_files/users/63/Media/numero_15.pdf](http://www.ecolecatholique.ca/user_files/users/63/Media/numero_15.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIALIZED ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying toolkits for educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media smarts (Canadian) Cyberbullying resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophelia Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Organizational members of the OBPC

1. Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario (CHEO)
2. Ottawa Police
3. Western Ottawa Community Resource Center Bullying Prevention Program
4. Principal from OCDSB
5. Youth Net
6. Orleans Cumberland Community Resource Center
7. Crossroads Children’s Centre
8. Family Services Ottawa
9. Day of Information for a Lifetime of Action/Youth Ottawa
10. City Councillor
11. City of Ottawa Public Health
12. Big Brothers & Big Sisters
13. Students- Carleton University
14. CHEO- Youth Net
15. Safe School principal Ottawa-Carleton District School Board (OCDSB)
16. Guidance OCDSB
17. Pinecrest-Queensway Community Health Centre
18. Eastern Community Resource Centre
19. Conseil Des Écoles Publiques d’Est de L’Ontario
20. Youth worker Orleans Cumberland Community Resource Centre
21. Parent Lifelines of Eastern Ontario (PLEO)
22. City lead OBPC
23. Growing Up Great
24. Ottawa Catholic School Board
25. Mothercraft
26. Ottawa Suicide Prevention Network
27. Lowertown Community Resource Centre
28. Preschool WOCRC
29. Red Cross
30. No More Bullies

Appendix D: List of Evidence Based Tools
**Individual Support:**
Empathy (Cognitive for children who are victimized, Affective and Cognitive for children who bully)
Problem solving & attribution
Academics (higher marks are a buffer for negative outcomes in both bullies and victims)
Resiliency for children and youth who are victims and bully-victims
Addressing pro-bullying attitudes in children and youth who bully others
Addressing gender related issues in bullying

**Peer support towards:**
Youth led initiatives and organizations
Creating a shift in youth norms
A forum for youth and children to lead anti-bullying initiatives
Supported peer mentoring models
Supported peer counselling models
Participatory research models
Restorative justice models (when used by someone who is trained and ensures the consent of the victim and aggressor before proceeding)
Age appropriate engagement strategies and support

**Parent Support:**
Skill training and coaching in how to assist children in building friendships, asserting themselves and managing conflict
Increase monitoring of children/youth who bully others
Train parents in how to build resiliency in children/youth who have been bullied
Address any violence which is within the home
Facilitate communication and access between parents, schools and community organizations
Advocacy training to help ensure children/youth are receiving the support they require

**Community/ Macro levels:**
Support front-line staff training for child centered organizations
Ensure tolerant and inclusive physical/social structures in all child/youth centered organizations
Provide on line tools (advocacy letters, policy information etc...) and information
Support safe school policy development and positive school climates
Raise awareness of social justice issues and human rights

Ensure a safe and accessibly reporting mechanism for every child

Increase supervision and monitoring of children/youth who are at risk

Provide a bullying support worker who can advocate in the community between families and organizations

Increase the cohesion between organizations, and equal access to services across Ottawa

Increase pathways of feedback for what is and is not effective, and where barriers lie